FORUM

Copyright 1946, by the Events Publishing Co.

Vol. CV JANUARY, 1946 No. 1

Changing attitudes toward the occupation of Germany

German Destruction or Regeneration?

By Felix E. Hirsch

Associate Professor of European History and Librarian at Bard College; former political editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*

IT seems hardly believable that but half a year has elapsed since the Potsdam conference, at which Truman, Attlee and Stalin laid down the law for the future of Germany. So much has happened since then, both inside and outside the vanquished country, that the solution which the "Big Three" adopted appears outdated and inadequate by now. The recent trend of developments has proved that the policies proposed by Lord Vansittart, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and their friends are essentially unsound. It has become evident that the influence which their ideas exerted on the peacemakers has not been helpful to the reconstruction of Europe.

The Potsdam agreements were originally rather well received in this country. Naturally, nobody had any sympathy with a nation whose leaders had committed so many outrages against humanity. But in that just anger about German atrocities many otherwise sober political analysts were inclined to forget those lessons that the world had learned from the mistakes committed at Versailles, lessons which Professor Sidney B. Fay summed up so capably in his recent article (*Forum,* November, 1945). Contrary to the prevailing attitude of American public opinion, some English observers sensed immediately after the Potsdam conference that the conditions imposed on Germany might be unworkable. Their spontaneous criticism was probably due to their greater familiarity with continental affairs, which naturally concern the British Isles so much more than they do the far distant United States. The London *Economist,* one of the most fearless English periodicals, deplored as early as August 11 that the settlement had not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the post-war world. The editorial concluded bluntly: "At the end of a mighty war fought to defeat Hitlerism, the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace. This is the real measure of their failure." Certainly no American journal of opinion—excepting, perhaps, a few Protestant and Catholic church weeklies —

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have used similar language at the time.

Since then, many officers of the American Military Government and civilian experts have been able to study the results of the Potsdam Declaration on the spot. Their criticism of various regulations has been mounting. A sense of frustration is apparent in many of the informal comments and formal statements that have come from members of the United States occupation forces. On the other hand, the "back-seat drivers" at home enjoy harping on actual or alleged failures of A.M.G., such as the unsatisfactory selection of personnel, the excesses of "'fraternization," etc. The critics forget at times that the real fault lies less with the human weakness of some officers than with the fundamental policies which they are duty-bound to carry out.

It is a great merit of the report which Byron Price, the excellent war-time Director of Censorship, recently made to Mr. Truman, at the President's request, that it points out the real issues. Not burdened with any responsibility for the conduct of the occupation, Price was able to study the German problem from a more detached point of view than even Generals Eisenhower and McNarney possess. The document which he produced following a six-week journey to the Reich does great credit to the courage of its author and to his gift of political analysis. No American in official or semi-official capacity has seen the urgency of the whole situation so clearly as did Price. His eight-point program is full of sound advice that should be heeded by all concerned. Naturally, he omits certain items that seem important to other observers. Let us look at some of his suggestions, before presenting a few of our own.

THE FRENCH ATTITUDE

It has long been clear to students of European affairs that France is not just aiming at temporary occupation of certain German areas, but that she is bent on dismembering the Reich. This policy is in tune with French historical traditions. It is understandable, after her sad experiences, that she wishes to protect her security more effectively than she did in the period between the two world wars. But this goal could be reached in a way that would not lead to the dire economic and political consequences which Price foresees now. His criticism of the obstructionist French attitude seems convincing. It is even bolder than some remarks made by General Eisenhower, who also is greatly worried about the almost complete lack of cohesion between the four zones of occupation. The American public should be reminded that Mr. Morgenthau's contention: "Two Germany's would be easier to deal with than one" is palpably erroneous. Any attempted separation would lead merely to even more violent outbursts of nationalism than we had in the past, eruptions that would end only after a reunion had been effected.

The German problem cannot be solved by partitions or by economic dismemberment. The salvation will come from a sound federal organization of the Reich. General Eisenhower took a first step in that di-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rection by combining the Prussian province Hesse-Nassau and the former state of Hesse in the land Gross-Hesse which, he felt, would be "strong and large enough to stand on its own feet." Decentralization of the whole governmental structure and elimination of Prussia's predominance will go far towards preventing the threat of a new dictatorship. Over a period of a century, the medium-sized states of southern Germany, especially Baden and Württemberg, showed a far more genuine tendency toward liberalism and democracy than did Bismarck's "greater Prussia."

FEEDING THE GERMANS?

It is a rather hard task to plead for better feeding of Germans after the unspeakable sufferings that their Nazi government brought to millions of innocent people all over the continent of Europe. We think of all the crimes committed against Jews, Poles, Russians, Czechs, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, etc., and don't quite like the idea of offering large-scale philanthropy in return. However, on second thought, Byron Price appears to be right in warning the occupation authorities: "If starvation comes, as now seems likely, epidemics and rioting will not be far behind." The Protestant Bishop of Berlin, Otto Dibelius, a man not given to wild exaggeration, recently expressed the belief that far more Germans would die of hunger this winter than had lost their lives on the battlefields during the second World War.

No Allied statesman desiring the restoration of a peaceable and healthy Europe could wish to share the responsibility for the consequences of such mass starvation, which would affect also the victorious nations eventually. Nor could any American politician continue to talk about the "re-education" of Germany, if people there were to die like flies. Therefore, Price's line of reasoning for shipping additional American food to the Reich on credit and for raising the basic ration of calories by about one-third seems well taken. The forced migration of millions of Germans who lived east of the Oder and in the Sudeten area till Poles and Czechs, in their understandable thirst for revenge, ousted them from their homes, has greatly added to the mass starvation. A good argument can be put up for the orderly exchange of populations as it was undertaken between Greece and Turkey a generation ago. But sudden up-rooting, as practiced in eastern Germany now, contrary to the Potsdam Declaration, cannot be defended.

There should be little disagreement between General McNarney, Eisenhower's successor, and Byron Price about the future administration of the American zone. The best available civilian will be just good enough for the job: "Second-raters not only would fail, but would involve this government in untold new difficulty." It will not be easy to find a sufficient number of men who combine tact with strictness, who know the language and understand the national character of Germany. But unless the right kind of personnel is gathered together, the most precise instructions will be of little avail.

It might be worth pondering whether or not the good services of some able and upright Swiss cit-

681041
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

izens should be engaged who naturally are in close touch with German political trends and German psychology and who might serve in various advisory capacities. Also there is in this country a fairly large reservoir of German political exiles whose reliability is above doubt; some of them could be useful, too, in performing specific tasks, even though they should not hold key positions. Hasty appointments of "good" Germans to administrative jobs for which they were ill fitted, and other errors might have been avoided, if these exiles with their wealth of detailed knowledge had been consulted in time.

A LONG OCCUPATION

The "very highest type of civilian administrators" as Price visualizes them, is indeed called for, since the occupation of Germany may last perhaps for half a generation. The complete "de-Nazification," which seems rather well under way by now, is, after all, only the first part of a much more tremendous job. General McNarney spoke recently of an occupation period of more than ten years and added significantly: "This would give the Germans time to establish themselves along democratic lines" and to perfect a program of economic self-support. The same language was used by General Eisenhower in his statesmanlike third report as military governor of the American zone. He, too, felt that a long occupation would be necessary to complete the reformation of the German people and conquer their apathy toward and ignorance of democratic processes and responsibilities. Only after such a long period of political organization and education could "the German people safely be entrusted with the complete control of its own government."

His remark is correct, since, according to Byron Price, Nora Waln and many other observers, the defeated have shown only slight interest in embracing the Anglo-Saxon ideal of democracy thus far. This is not so surprising, since, for 12 years, the Germans had heard only misrepresentations of the democratic way of life. Now that their evil political mentors have vanished, they are busy hunting for food, collecting kindling wood and trying to keep their bombed houses from collapsing. At such a juncture of events, hardly much solid thought will be given to what might be the most desirable form of government for them.

Does that mean that the masses in Germany are still as anti-democratic as they appeared to be, at least on the surface, in Hitler's heyday? This is most unlikely. If there were nation-wide (not just local) elections in Germany tomorrow, their trend would hardly differ much from the tendencies recently observed in Austria. There the two basically democratic groups, the People's party and the Social Democrats, controlled an even larger share of the ballots than they had had before the Hitler coup of 1938. In the Reich also the Social Democrats probably would poll a much larger vote than their Communist competitors, who have not grown more popular under the Russian occupation. In the Catholic areas of the South and West the Christian-Democratic party certainly would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fall heir to the defunct Center party and its more reactionary offspring, the Bavarian People's party, and again muster a majority, or, at least, a strong plurality. This is not just a wild guess; responsible officers of the A.M.G. expressed a similar belief publicly.

Therefore, the major task is to find within these groups — and among the members of the Liberal-Democratic party which represents the remnants of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia—enough men and women who can be entrusted with a gradually increasing share in civil government. Certainly quite a few capable and reliable elements have survived among those hundreds of thousands of his fellow countrymen whom Hitler kept in his concentration camps, even though many of the best Germans died from torture or exhaustion behind barbed wires long ago. American officials who are well-versed in German affairs and in the whole cultural background of the pre-Hitler generation ought to have also little trouble in detecting a far larger number of well-intentioned and competent civil servants, professors, lawyers, etc., than have come to the fore thus far. Patient search and constant encouragement will bear fruit; both seem to have been lacking in earlier stages of the occupation. Usually personalities with a more sensitive character will not crowd the antichambers of the victors; they will leave the precedence to the uninhibited job-hunters who will be "loyal" to any cause as long as it pays.

There are many ways of promoting and speeding up the process of German regeneration; this term seems preferable to the much abused word "'re-education," which permits the utterly wrong interpretation, as if outsiders were to do the main job instead of the Germans themselves. One avenue of approach is the improvement of conditions existing in the German press (see my article in *Current History,* August, 1945). Byron Price, certainly a first-rate expert on this subject, points out in his report that democratic propaganda should be given a more positive character. "The German people," he says, "in some instances have no more faith in the information they are receiving than they did in that distributed by Goebbels." Book publishers of distinction, I would add, should also get encouragement (and paper). Houses that once served German civilization so well as did *Insel-Verlag, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, S. Fischer* (now in Stockholm), *Julius Springer,* etc., have still a contribution to make in days to come. There is a real thirst for undiluted and unpoisoned knowledge in Germany after the henchmen of Alfred Rosenberg and Joseph Goebbels dominated the literary and scholarly output for a dozen years. How deep this longing is may be gauged from a statement made recently by Professor Friedrich Zucker, a noted philologist and Acting Rector of the University of Jena: "In any case it remains the urgent wish and the hope of all those who have remained loyal to objective research work during twelve years of oppression, that cooperation and exchange of thought abroad, and especially with the United States of America as existed before and with such good results,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be taken up again in the not too distant future." (Association of American Colleges, Bulletin, October, 1945.)

This brief appraisal of the German situation would be incomplete if not a few words were said about the future rôle of the spiritual forces in the Reich. Occasionally even a very disconcerting and highly controversial publication may contain some phrases that ring true. There are two such striking sentences in Heinrich Hauser's otherwise rather flippant recent book, *The German Talks Back*. He seems to speak for his countrymen when saying: "As a nation we have gone to the Devil. But as individuals many of us have gone, and more and more of us will go—to God."

Hauser's drastic remarks are in line with all eyewitness reports that have come to us from Germany during the last seven or eight months. They have tended to confirm a conviction that the present writer has held since the early days of the Third Reich. Soon he recognized that the religious organizations which had stood out against the forces of evil, alone would have the strength some day to serve as fountains of a national regeneration. In their unparalleled disaster, the Germans have reason to be grateful for the good fortune that with them are still those who dared to fight openly the anti-Christian teachings and barbarian actions of Adolf Hitler's government: such men as Martin Niemöller, Otto Dibelius, Karl Barth, Michael Faulhaber and Konrad von Preysing. They are better qualified than anybody coming from the outside world to serve as leaders in the process of German reconstruction.

Byron Price and many others report that the Germans apparently lack a sense of their war guilt. While they resent any accusations coming from foreigners, they seem to accept willingly the moral castigation that they receive from their own trusted religious leaders. Nothing can help the regeneration of the German nation so much as spontaneous appeals such as that made by the powerful Brandenburg Synod of the Evangelical Church on the Day of Repentance (November 21, 1945): "We Germans have removed the Ten Commandments from our public life and have acted contrary to the law of God. Now we are reaping the consequences of our deeds. We have become Godless, outlawed people. But God's word also calls us to the cleansing of our personal and public lives." These are the confessions of courageous men who face the future humbly, but not without hope.

• Once, in the post office of a small North Carolina village, I saw the local patriarch sitting on a flour barrel and whittling. A bystander informed me that the old fellow had already passed his hundredth birthday. Impressed, I exclaimed: "Isn't that amazing!"

"We don't see nothin' amazing about it 'round here," was the laconic reply. "All he's done is grown old—and took longer than most people would to do that!"

—*The South African Forum*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia and the Far East

By Michael T. Florinsky

Professor of Political Science, Columbia University

NO balanced account of Russian foreign policy can disregard the fact that the Soviet Union is both a nationalistic and a great imperialistic power and the leader of international communism striving for the overthrow of capitalism and the advancement of world revolution. It would be a mistake to imagine that the Kremlin is oblivious of Russia's imperial tradition; it would be a no less grievous error, however, to dismiss the revolutionary doctrines of Marx, Lenin and Stalin as having no bearing on Soviet foreign policy. The peculiar integration of the two elements—imperial and revolutionary—is, I believe, the mainspring of Moscow's foreign moves.

Russia's active participation in international rivalries in the Pacific area goes back to the 1850's when the imperial government wangled from China the Amur region and the Maritime province. It is less generally known that the winning over of the teeming millions of colonial and semi-colonial peoples both in the Far and in the Near East is regarded by communist leaders as essential to the success of their cause. The most spectacular venture of this nature was the "First" Congress of the eastern peoples held, under the auspices of the Third (Communist) International, in Baku in September, 1920. The object and the meaning of this multinational gathering were well conveyed by its chairman Zinovev, who was also president of the Third International, in a speech delivered at Halle in October, 1920: "If Marx once said that a European revolution without England would be merely a tempest in a teacup, then we will tell you . . . that proletarian revolution without Asia will not be a world revolution. . . . At the Baku congress we discovered the element that in the past was missing in the proletarian movement. . . . The oppressed masses of Asia must awaken. . . . When in Baku I beheld hundreds of Persians and Turks join us in singing 'The International' I felt my eyes fill with tears and I recognized the breathing of the world revolution." A quarter of a century has passed since the Baku meeting and much water has flowed under the bridge. No other congress of eastern peoples was ever held; Zinovev fell a victim of the great purge, and the Third International was dissolved in May, 1943. Yet Zinovev's statement is of more than historic interest because the aims of Russian communism are not subject to revision, even though its methods change and its doctrine has been amended in some essential respects.

The concerted effort for the ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vancement of revolution in the East did not end with the adjournment *sine die* of the Baku congress. In 1921 there was founded in Moscow the Communist University of the Toilers of the East. Addressing that institution on May 18, 1925, Stalin pointed out that its student body was drawn partly from the Soviet East, and partly from "colonial and dependent countries, countries where capitalism is still supreme, where the yoke of imperialism remains unshaken, and where one has still to fight for independence by ejecting the imperialists." The emancipation of the colonial and dependent nations, according to Stalin, cannot be achieved until the following three conditions have been fulfilled: (1) "a victorious revolution;" (2) liberation of the masses of toilers in those countries from the influence of local bourgeois groups willing to cooperate with foreign imperialists; this requires "the establishment of the hegemony of the proletariat, the organization of the advanced elements of the working class [in each country] into an independent communist party;" and (3) cooperation between the national movements of the colonial and dependent countries with the proletarian movements of the advanced western nations.

In the Far East, as in Europe, however, the interest of Moscow in the promotion of revolutionary agitation has not been uniformly sustained. There were long periods when the Kremlin definitely soft-pedalled revolutionary propaganda in colonial and dependent countries. Signs have not been lacking, indeed, that the Soviets were withdrawing from the Pacific area,—for instance, the sale to Manchukuo of Russia's share in the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1935. The state of chaos World War II left in its wake in the Far East has basically changed this situation.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC

It is a telling comment on the devious course of Moscow diplomacy that the Soviet Union, until her actual involvement in the hostilities in Europe and Asia, was linked by non-aggression or neutrality pacts with both her prospective antagonists, Germany and Japan. Here, however, the similarity between the European and the Asiatic situation ends. Russian cooperation with Hitler's Germany was more intimate than that with distant Japan and it led to the partition of Poland and the absorption by the Soviet Union of the Baltic states and other territories. It was Hitler, moreover, who broke the partnership by attacking the Soviet Union. During the ensuing war the U.S.S.R. suffered terrible devastation while it made important contributions to final victory.

Russia's part in the Pacific war was very different. The five-year neutrality pact with Japan was signed in Moscow on April 13, 1941, in an atmosphere of great cordiality. At the Yalta conference in February, 1945, it was decided that Russia should enter the war against Japan within three months after the termination of war in Europe. At the same time, according to Mr. Byrnes, the United States and, presumably, Great Britain, "tacitly agreed" to the annexation by the Soviets of the Kurile Islands and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

southern part of Sakhalin. On April 5, Moscow denounced its pact with Japan and on August 8, shortly after the first atomic bomb was released on Hiroshima, she declared war. Hostilities were officially terminated on September 2, but no Russian military action occurred after August 23. Although the Soviets assembled a huge land force in the Far East and had no difficulty in overrunning Manchuria and Korea, their naval resources were inadequate to the task in view. Washington hastened to their assistance. From March to September, 1945, the United States operated at Cold Bay, a tiny island in the Aleutians, a highly secret naval base where some two hundred landing craft, mine sweepers and other small vessels were turned over to the Soviet Navy and more than 12,000 Russians received necessary training. It was, presumably, these American craft and their American-trained crews that made it possible for the Russians to land in Sakhalin, the Kuriles and other Japanese-held islands.

THE SINO SOVIET TREATY

On August 14, that is, while the Russian *Blitzkreig* was still on, the Soviet and the Chinese governments signed a treaty of "alliance and friendship" together with five supplementary agreements which were ratified ten days later and were made public on August 26. Rumors of the impending Sino-Soviet settlement were long current and few were surprised to learn that Soviet ambitions were gratified largely at the expense of China, a country so recently elevated to the dignity of a great power. There was, however, substantial accord among American and British commentators that the concessions secured by Moscow were neither unreasonable nor harsh, and at least one distinguished American authority went so far as to assert that the agreements of August 14 were the most magnanimous settlement ever granted to China by a western nation. The facts of the case hardly justify this facile optimism, even though the dealings of the West with China were never noted for excessive generosity.

The combined effect of the Yalta commitments and of the Chinese agreements was to restore the Soviet Union to a position of predominance in the Far East, even greater than that enjoyed by imperial Russia prior to the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-1905. Moscow obtained from China a half-interest in and the virtual management of the Chinese Eastern and the Southern Manchurian Railways, now merged into the Chinese Changchun Railway; recovered Port Arthur as a joint Russo-Chinese naval base which was placed under Russian control and closed to the warships of other nations; and secured special privileges in Dairen (Dalny), which became a free port. China, moreover, surrendered all claims to Outer Mongolia, a vast, sparsely populated region long dominated by Moscow. In a plebiscite held at the end of October Outer Mongolia dutifully proclaimed her desire to be "independent;" the degree of Soviet influence may be gathered from the fact that the vote was unanimous.

The Soviet gains listed above, including the annexation of the Kurile

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Islands and of the southern part of Sakhalin (still to be confirmed by the peace conference, if and when such conference meets), are in line with the policies of the Russian imperial government, even though Russia's "historic" claims to the possession or control of these territories are not too impressive. Russian occupation of Sakhalin began in the early 1850's; in 1875 Russia acquired from Japan the southern part of Sakhalin in exchange for the Kurile Islands over which she had claimed jurisdiction from the end of the eighteenth century. In 1905 the southern part of Sakhalin was regained by Japan. Russian control over Port Arthur and Dairen lasted for merely seven years, from 1898, when Russia leased from China the Liaotung Peninsula, to 1905 when the lease was transferred to Japan by the treaty of Portsmouth. The Chinese Eastern Railway, built by the Russians at the end of the last century, has been a source of much friction and has changed hands several times. The conclusion is not unwarranted that in 1945 Moscow was following in the footsteps of the imperial government.

MOSCOW AND THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

There is, however, another side to the picture. While the concessions granted by China to the Soviet Union represent net tangible gains (provided, of course, that expansion and acquisition of special privileges is considered desirable), concessions given by the Soviet Union to China are of a very different nature. Moscow merely bound itself to respect China's territorial integrity, to lend its support to the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek, and to withdraw the Red Army from Manchuria not later than three months after the end of the war. "Non-interference in the internal affairs" of the other contracting party, provided by the pact, was generally interpreted as a pledge that Moscow would not support the Chinese communists. It would seem, however, that since the outbreak of the Kuomintang - communist civil war, Soviet authorities in China have tended to evade, if not to violate openly, both the spirit and the letter of the agreement by facilitating the activities of the communists and by hindering those of the National Government, even though the Red Army appears to be withdrawing according to schedule.

Conditions in communist - held China and the exact relationship between the Chinese communists and Moscow is something of a mystery. The number of westerners admitted to the communist-controlled provinces is small; their observations are on the whole favorable, too favorable perhaps to inspire complete confidence. Recently, however, discordant notes have been sounded. Steffen Andrews, writing from Kalgan, Inner Mongolia, which has been brought under communist rule, pays tribute to improvements wrought by the communists in the economic status of the coolies, factory workers and peasants, but adds significantly: "The price in terms of personal liberties that the communists exact for these reforms is staggering. As soon as they take over a town they kill off indepen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent thought, set up rigid press control, let loose an army of secret police and shoot all political opponents who might even attempt to dissent." (*New York Times,* November 1, 1945). This description is reminiscent of conditions reported to exist in the countries of eastern and southern Europe occupied by the Red Army, and the policies of the Chinese communists, if accurately recorded by Andrews, appear to be in agreement with Stalin's program for the Eastern countries outlined above. It would be odd if the Chinese communists were not looked upon with favor, if not openly supported, by the Red Army and Soviet authorities.

JAPAN AND INDONESIA

Little needs to be said concerning the attitude of the Soviet Union towards Japan. The administration of the defeated Empire of the Rising Sun is one of the many questions on which the U.S.S.R. and the other principal "United Nations" are in total disagreement. The policies pursued in Japan by Washington and General MacArthur are viewed in Moscow as far too tame and cautious. The Soviets have demanded a commission of control, with full powers, and the right of veto for its members. At the end of November, when these lines were written, the Kremlin has not yet accepted the invitation to appoint a representative to the Far Eastern Advisory Commission set up in Washington. The retention by the United States of much of Japan's political and social structure is clearly incompatible with the Soviet vision of a new world.

There is nothing to indicate that the revolt in Java, which has involved the British in a new and particularly distressing kind of war, was instigated by Moscow, although the Indonesian nationalists are reported to have appealed to Stalin. The struggle of the Indonesians for national independence will undoubtedly command the sympathy of the Soviet government, but this is a feeling which is shared in every country by many people who have no liking for Russian communism.

Security and the determination to prevent the recurrence of aggression is the *leit-motif* of the argument presented by the Kremlin in justification of its foreign policy. In an article in the December issue of *Forum* I expressed the opinion that the plea of security, as the reason for Soviet territorial expansion and the establishment of "friendly" governments in neighboring states, is not convincing. This statement is correct, I believe, if we think of security in the traditional sense accepted in the western world. Security, however, like democracy, means something different in Moscow from what it means in Washington or London. Stalin has stated on many occasions, for instance in his address to the eighteenth congress of the Communist party in March, 1939, that the Soviet Union—the land of socialism—could not achieve complete security so long as the capitalist environment exists. The attainment of security in this sense—that is, the destruction of the capitalist environment—is one of the basic factors in Soviet foreign policy both in Europe and in the East.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Allied handling of the German educational system presents many dilemmas

Our Responsibility for German Universities

By Sidney B. Fay

Professor of History, Harvard University

AS a result of winning a war which we did not start, we have had forced upon us great responsibilities. One of these concerns the future of the German universities. German concentration camps have stopped—because we and our Allies stopped them. But a hundred other German institutions or operations—railroads, factories, stores, schools, churches, concerts, movies, sports, industries — have also stopped, because we, or our Allies, or Germans defending themselves against us, have stopped them.

We stopped all these things by overthrowing the sovereign German state, by killing, maiming or imprisoning German men or women who were performing these functions, and by physically destroying the buildings, machinery and other material property without which the work could not be carried on. We have destroyed the Nazi party, the German Reich and the Prussian Army; but the German people, and what is left of their institutions, remain.

Among these institutions which have survived the Nazi shipwreck, battered and forlorn, are the German universities. Seven of these, including the oldest, Heidelberg (founded in 1386), are in the United States Zone of Occupation. American scholars, many of whom owe their academic training, directly or indirectly, to these institutions, have a right to know what has happened to them, and what chance they have to continue to function as an integral part of world scholarship.

The ravages of war and defeat have literally torn asunder the system of German higher education. Superficially the destruction appears more drastic even than the absorption of the German universities in the Nazi totalitarian state, which swept away so many of their best traditions. Present wounds, however, are not so deep that they cannot, with time, be healed, whereas under Hitler the universities were doomed to slow extinction, because the life-blood of science—freedom of expression and inquiry — was lacking.

At the height of its power in 1941, Nazi Germany disposed of 29 full-fledged universities, plus numerous technical and other specialized institutions. Two of these universities, Poznan and Strassburg, were creations of the war, *Reichsuniversitäten,* intended to implant the culture of the conqueror in annexed territories in East and West. These two universities have now reverted to their own nationals. In the case of Strassburg, the refugee French faculty, which had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meanwhile continued their university under great difficulties at Clermont - Ferrand, has returned. Whether Poland has been able to scrape together an adequate staff from the vast prison into which the Germans had converted their country is not known. Similarly, the University of Prague, to which the Germans have always maintained historical claims, has reverted to the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

Two genuinely German universities have been lost in territorial cessions to the United Nations: Königsberg to the U.S.S.R. and Breslau to Poland.

The three Austrian universities, which had close ties with the German institutions long before the *Anschluss,* are now administered under the Military Government of Occupation Forces: Vienna on a quadripartite basis, Graz by the British, Innsbruck by the French.

Finally, in Germany proper, Rostock, Greifswald, Leipzig, Halle and Jena fall within the Russian zone; Bonn, Cologne, Münster, Göttingen, Hamburg, Kiel and the Düsseldorf Medical Academy come under the British; the French have Freiburg and Tübingen; while the American zone includes Marburg, Giessen, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Würzburg, Erlangen and Munich. The University of Berlin is shared by the four controlling powers who govern the Berlin area.

This intrusion of foreign influence in the field of German higher education is only part of the story of administrative decentralization, however, since the original German administration apparatus has in large part simply disappeared. The Reich Ministry of Education, which since 1937 controlled, administered and financed all German universities, has ceased to exist. The Prussian Ministry of Education, which before 1933 controlled 12 universities, has also vanished. Most fortunate are institutions which until 1933 were controlled by *Länder* (state governments), or by municipalities which are now in process of reconstruction.

Some of the best institutions, however, are left hanging in the air. Marburg, for example, which was founded in 1527 by a local prince, was administered down to 1866 by the *Kurfürstentum* (Electorate or Principality) of Hesse-Cassel; after the absorption of this little state by Prussia, Marburg was run from Berlin, like other Prussian universities, by a curator appointed by the Prussian Ministry of Education. When Prussia was merged with the Reich in 1933, Marburg came directly under the Reich Education Minister. Now, with the demise of the Reich and Prussia, and the complete break in continuity from the *Kurfürstentum* in 1866, Marburg is a university without a governmental sponsor, pending the creation of some new *Land* regime by the military government. As an interim measure, its bills are being covered by the town of Marburg and by the *Regierungsbezirk* Kassel.

LACK OF PROFESSORS

If, from the point of view of control and administration, German higher education is chaotic, the condition of the teaching staffs of German universities is well-nigh catastrophic. Before 1914 the world turned to Germany for instruction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German higher schools were at their best in the Bismarckian and Wilhelmian era; the peak of attendance by American students was reached in 1889, and from then on our own institutions sought to apply at home the lessons learned from abroad.

The last professors of the pre-1914 staff can still be found in Germany today—men in their late seventies or eighties, clinging to the peripheries of universities which repudiated them all during the Nazi period. They are available for the work of educational reconstruction, but they cannot last long. Some are too far gone to do anything but work or survive for themselves on the side-lines.

The aged Professor Friedrich Meinecke, for 40 years editor of the *Historische Zeitschrift,* successor to Heinrich von Sybel and student of Ranke and Treitschke, fled the Berlin bombings in February, 1945, almost perished in the conflagration of Würzburg, and later was burned out of an old Bavarian castle where he had sought refuge. Now he lives with his wife and daughter in a few rooms the British have found for him near the University of Göttingen. He is working on his autobiography as well as a study on "Causes of the German Catastrophe." Almost deaf and blind, his services are not available as professor. Also in Göttingen are Hermann Oncken and Max Planck. Oncken's maid was raped and murdered during the Russian conquest of Berlin, while Planck's son was executed by the Nazis for involvement in the July 20th plot. In Heidelberg a respectable number of the old "Max Weber Circle" still survive — his widow, Marianna; his brother, Alfred; the theologian Dibelius; the philosopher Jaspers; the jurists Anschütz and Radbruch. But in most cases these men are in feeble health and have not many years or months in which to take hold again of academic youth.

Most of these veterans of the pre-1914 era were emeriti when the Nazis took over. Their retirement was a simple affair. All younger groups, already decimated by casualties of the war and economic disorders of the twenties, were systematically combed over by the Nazis for non-Aryans and other politically objectionable categories. In the first four years of the Nazi regime between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of all the staffs of German universities were driven into exile, retired on meagre pensions, or "put away" in prisons, concentration camps or execution chambers. After these four years of Nazi purge, Heidelberg, for example, had only 95 of its original staff, while 87 new appointees had been added.

Of the professors living today, therefore, approximately one-half are survivals of the pre-Nazi period, and one-half are Nazi appointees. Both of these groups have great drawbacks from the point of view of present reconstruction. Conditions under the Nazis placed a premium on collaboration for survival, sometimes genuine, sometimes assumed. Furthermore, the men selected by the Nazi rulers of the universities, often enough not Nazis by conviction themselves, were all too often mediocre scholars, selected by men with inferior scholarly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

judgment. Present staffs are weighted down by second or third rate scholar-teachers, who now, by the political test, survive the departure of their erstwhile Nazi bosses. The number of men left who are genuine scholars and managed to keep their hands clean of Nazi pollution is a small fraction of what will be needed to run the universities.

One can, to be sure, open the institutions, but with the certain risk of leaving the instruction of the youth in the hands of men who will poison it politically, or else give it poor instruction. Even to find enough men who are politically acceptable and *on hand* (not prisoners of war, ill or missing) will require years if more than a fraction of the universities are to be opened.

SELECTION OF PROFESSORS

In spite of German lack of familiarity with democratic patterns, and the persistance of evil habits bred under an evil system, the military government has tried to encourage at every turn university initiative, from the wise conviction that personnel decisions imposed "from above" would, although following the autocratic Prussian formula, never find the same acceptance as actions by the faculties themselves. Futhermore, German universities have long traditions of academic self-government deriving from medieval guild structure. High-handed disregard of these faculty "rights" (of appointment, promotion and the granting of degrees) would have a most unfortunate effect. One could reliably predict that dismissals actually desired by the faculty would appear arbitrary had they been simply "ordered" by the military government. On the other hand, the setting up of Faculty Planning Committees to select new faculties, among other things, involved an act of faith on the part of the military government, for if the accredited democratic process failed to produce "right results" we should have no choice but to repudiate it.

Not the least of the headaches of military government officers is trying to discriminate between political naïveté and political conviction, and if it seems to be genuine naïveté, then trying to decide whether it is of such a degree as to disqualify a man from full participation in academic self-government (e. g. in elections, or in holding office) even though as a scholary specialist he may be qualified to be a teacher of the young. For example, an outstanding professor of medicine, whose dossier in the university files indicated (he had not felt it sufficiently important to put it on his official military government questionnaire) that for something like eight years he had contributed a small sum monthly to the SS. When questioned, he said he had regarded this as a form of social welfare at the time and never thought about the matter again, letting his secretary make the payments on a routine basis. It is a horrible thought to realize that Hitler's terrorism was as a matter of fact supported by many educated Germans like this professor,—educated in everything but in the art of realistic political thinking.

Even with the most efficient governmental administration and the best of teaching staffs (neither of which they have!), the German

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

universities of today would still face grave problems of supply, buildings, equipment and teaching materials. Cologne, for example, was bombed, fought over, looted, and then abandoned for weeks during the absence of virtually the entire faculty, who had fled for safety. In Giessen scarcely a single university building survived the great incendiary raid of December, 1944; while at Würzburg the university is barely distinguishable amid the forest of ghastly ruins that is all that is left of the city.

Certain of the universities suffered no major damage to their buildings, owing to the happy circumstance that they were located in non-industrial areas or were protected as hospital centers. But even Heidelberg and Marburg, where this was the case, confront a host of practical problems. Not the least is the recovery of hundreds of thousands of library books evacuated for safe-keeping to various remote castles, salt-mines and other store-houses. Some of these store-houses have been damaged and the books have suffered. In one dramatic case, where books and archives from several major libraries were stored in a phosphorous mine, fire broke out and destroyed virtually all the documents.

Gaps in reading matter of an even more serious sort result from the increasingly provincial outlook of German scholarship, only in part imposed by Nazi policies, which developed ever since World War I. With the Nazi restrictions, fewer German scholars went abroad (far more went abroad to stay!); fewer foreign books and journals were purchased; and far fewer students came to Germany from England and America to study; and, with the war, subscriptions to foreign journals dwindled and all but disappeared. It is not unusual to find professional libraries in fields like medicine or natural science, where vast progress has been made in the last years and decades, containing no non-German books at all.

In the humanities as well, German scholarship might be living on a different planet. One prominent mathematician had developed an interest in the history of his subject, and written a number of monographs during the past ten years on Greek mathematics. By the accident of his location in the intellectual desert of modern Germany, he had never heard of the journal *Isis,* nor of George Sarton's monumental *Introduction to the History of Science.*

In some few cases this insularity may have produced results, by virtue of its very singleness of purpose, as in the case of the unhappy sociologist who had devoted himself to unravelling the secrets of the ancient Etruscan language—as a means of escaping the pitfalls of his own "dangerous field."

The men left to do the teaching are not merely restricted in intellectual horizon and out-of-date in their professional education. They are frightfully fatigued by the experience of war and dictatorship. They are in many cases meek and mediocre men, who have learned how to say and think whatever is best for the sake of saving their skins. Now they are weak in body as well as in spirit, as their rations are low and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their diet unbalanced. Often they have been bombed out or evicted, and hence live meagre existences, in cramped quarters and without professional libraries. Those who have suffered in prison are in dangerous physical condition, and cannot be expected to survive without special care.

On top of all these difficulties, the German universities now have to beg for their existence from the Allied military governments which are operating under a directive which says in substance: "De-Nazify, and then leave them to their own devices." Slowly, despite the absence of normal mail and train service, the universities with the most usable facilities are gathering together makeshift faculties. What these faculties will teach, in the months and years to come, will depend in large measures on the aid and recognition they receive from abroad. At the present time neither U.N.R.R.A. nor any other Allied welfare or cultural relations agency, private or public, is interested in aiding German scholars, to say nothing of the people at large.

The Russians, as is understandable, are largely interested in reparations, and are systematically shipping the contents of German libraries and laboratories to the Soviet Union. The French have retrieved a certain amount of scientific equipment from their zone. Both British and French appear willing to foster cultural relations with German scholars who have passed the screening tests, and, as soon as sentiment in their own countries is ready, will probably launch programs of student and teacher exchanges. Thus far very little is clear save the intent.

American policy with respect to German universities is, like our policy with respect to most other German affairs, shot through with paradoxes. On the one hand, there is the urge to "re-educate" the Germans. This motivated the excellent work of the Information Control Division in first controlling and then gradually liberating a re-born German newspaper press. On the other hand, there is a demand to destroy German military potential and the Nazi political dogmas and organizations. If war industry is to be destroyed, so too war scientific research, whatever alternative uses it may have. If the Nazi party is to disappear, so too its proponents in academic circles, however important their work in scholarship and learning.

OUR DILEMMA

There is our dilemma in a nutshell, and it is merely one phase of the dilemma presented by modern science in general. Can we gain more by promoting German science, perhaps the only major positive value Germany still shares with the rest of the world, than we would lose by risking covert German preparation, through scientific research, for another war?

It is significant that Professor Karl Jaspers made this problem, in its broader aspects, the theme of his opening address on the occasion of inaugurating the first course of higher studies in post-Nazi Germany —the refresher medical course for Wehrmacht doctors, which began at Heidelberg on August 15, 1945. It would be dangerous, he argued, to build a university curriculum out of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"specialities" alone, for it is only the humanities, and especially philosophy, which can give the student a sense of values and a perspective in which to apply his special skill.

There are three ways in which we can solve the dilemma. We can forbid the German all higher education, which is the course the Nazis followed in Poland. Or we can permit higher education in the humanities and all other "non-military" subjects alone. Or, finally, we can permit a full curriculum, trusting to the effort of the humanists and the philosophers to "re-educate" their charges, so that future leaders of the nation will not be tempted to misuse the fruits of science to the detriment of humanity.

A moment's consideration suffices to indicate that the first two courses are impractical. Who is the all-seeing scientist who could examine all research projects and reject those certain to lead into "dangerous" fields? An attempt to control humanity, or even a conquered nation, by putting up "Off Limits" signs all over the field of knowledge is an idea more characteristic of the Prussian military spirit we are trying to uproot than of those United Nations who have placed their faith in the ultimate realizability of common humane goals.

The sorcerer's apprentice, playing with atomic bombs, has become one of the family, so to speak. He is not to be controlled by any single command. The only realistic solution is to educate him. But this means a genuinely positive effort to work with and service the men we leave or place in charge of German higher education—work which is our responsibility by virtue of our dominant position in ruling the affairs of a defeated enemy nation. Nor is there any reason why this work should prejudice our efforts in other needy countries.

It thus develops that the dilemma which confronts the Allied military government in controlling German higher education is only one form of the dilemma which faces our whole civilization, namely, the problem of harnessing scientific research to the service of humanity. By a strange freak of fortune we find ourselves in a more advantageous position to solve this dilemma in Germany, where we are absolute masters, and where the higher educational system must be rebuilt virtually from the foundations, than in our own country or in those of our Allies. The older generation of German scholars has a few years left in which to re-establish the best elements of the pre-1933 tradition. Their successors will have as much time and as much opportunity to continue the work as we and our Allies permit them.

• A salesman making a two-weeks' stay in town bought some limburger cheese to eat in his room. When he got ready to leave, he still had about half of the cheese left. He didn't want to pack it nor did he want to leave it lying in the room. He went over to the windowsill, carefully removed a plant from its pot, buried the cheese and replaced the plant.

A few days later, he received a telegram from the hotel: "We give up, where did you put it?"

—*The Line*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Silver bloc is the pressure group par excellence

Economics by Law

By Nathan Baily

Professor of Economics, The College of the City of New York; Research Institute of America

THE O.P.A.'s recent action increasing the ceiling price for foreign silver spotlights an interesting chapter in American economic history. It is a story of vested interests and pressure groups; of legislative blocs and the balance of power; of the interaction of domestic problems upon international relations. Above all, it provides a useful lesson of what might be termed "economics by law."

To untangle the complicated threads, one must go back to the Civil War period. At that time the United States was officially on a bimetallic standard, but the silver dollar had almost disappeared from circulation. Since the ratio of silver to gold on the open market was below the mint or legal ratio, the metal was worth more for industrial purposes than in the form of coin. Thus, the almost negligible quantity of silver that was coined was used largely for export purposes.

In 1869 two Treasury employees were assigned to revise and codify the existing coinage laws. It took Congress four years to enact their proposals into a law which, among other things, dropped the silver dollar from the list of coins which could be minted. There was virtually no discussion or opposition to this action. The "Crime of 1873" did not become a crime until some time after it had been committed.

Shortly afterward, the situation changed rapidly. The declining output of gold and the sharply increased production of silver steadily reduced the value of silver. As the rich western mines poured forth their treasure, the price of silver dropped more rapidly. Further, silver was losing popularity as a standard elsewhere. Germany adopted the gold standard in 1871, Sweden and Norway in 1874, and Holland in 1875. France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Greece suspended and later ceased coinage of silver during this period.

The effect of this decline in the price of silver was to make the bullion in the silver dollar worth less than a dollar. This stimulated a rush to the mint to transform silver bullion into coins — but this now profitable action was no longer legal.

Cries soon arose against the "Crime of 1873." Silver producers sought to restore the "free and unlimited" coinage of silver to check the decline in the price of their product; greenbackers and other "cheap money" advocates backed the program in the hope that large-scale overvaluation would check the general deflationary trend that was taking place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "inflationists" took their economic doctrines to the polling place. The silver bloc, consisting largely of senators from the sparsely settled states where silver production is concentrated, emerged as a potent force in Congress. (Table I.) By controlling the balance of power and engaging in political "swaps," it gained sufficient strength to force the passage of the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 over the President's veto. Under this measure, the Secretary of the Treasury had to buy not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 of silver each month to be coined into dollars. Despite the fact that the Secretary purchased only the minimum, $378,166,000 was coined and placed into circulation. This indirect subsidy failed to check the decline of either silver or the general price level; Secretary Sherman and his successors, by standing ready to redeem silver dollars in gold, largely defeated the hopes of the silverites.

TABLE I

POPULATION OF THE SEVEN MAJOR SILVER STATES

By State, 1940

State	total U. S. Population	per cent of Population*
Arizona	426,792	.36
Colorado	1,106,502	.93
Idaho	519.292	.44
Montana	540,468	.46
Nevada	104,030	.09
New Mexico	492,312	.41
Utah	542,920	.46
Total	3,732,316	3.15

*Total population in the United States in 1940, 138,392,040. The seven states have 15 Representatives or 3.5 per cent of the House; their 14 Senators comprise 14.6 per cent of the Senate.

Source: *World Almanac,* 1945, p. 488.

The silver bloc sought further action. As the price of their support of the McKinley tariff bill, the silver senators won the Sherman Silver Act of 1890. This provided for government purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver monthly, to be paid for by Treasury notes which were in turn redeemable in either gold or silver coin. This figure approximated the total domestic production of silver; it was on a quantity basis and left no alternatives of minimum or maximum. Under this mandate, the Treasury purchased $156,000,000 worth of silver bullion, an amount sufficient for $218,000,000 silver dollars.

Still the price of silver declined—and its output increased. With the Panic of 1893 providing the lever, President Cleveland forced the repeal of the Sherman Act over bitter opposition and attempted delay. This action lost Cleveland the support of the western and southern wings of his party, a loss which was overcome by means of a coalition of eastern Democrats and eastern Republicans. The alliance continued and collected its fee in the Wilson-Gorman Tariff of 1894. Cleveland, disgusted with this "piece of party perfidy," refused to sign the measure which so clearly violated the Democratic campaign pledges.

The government's actions provided the basic issue for the election of 1896—"free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1." The Democratic party, won over by the silverites and their silver-tongued orator, William Jennings Bryan,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

based their campaign on support of that proposal.

"We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be a full legal tender, equally with gold, for all debts, public and private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal tender money by private contract."

This was the answer of the Democrats to Republican opposition to free coinage of silver "'except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world." The importance of the 16 to 1 ratio to the inflationists becomes readily apparent if one realizes that the ratio of silver to gold on the open market in 1894 was 32.5 to 1 (this meant the silver bullion in the dollar was worth about 50c). This was indeed "cheap" money—it exerted an enormous appeal upon farmers burdened with debts and suffering from declining prices for their products.

"The silver interest in the States made the most of the depression and continuously declining prices from which the farmers were beginning to suffer. . . . This was no doubt at the bottom of the agitation which was carried on there for several years." (An English observer writing in 1894, quoted by Bratter, H. M., *Should We Turn to Silver?*)

The campaign proved one of the bitterest in American history. Both Democrats and Republicans split; the gold wing Democrats held their own convention and chose their own candidates; the silver Republicans, led by Henry M. Teller of Colorado, bolted the regular party convention. The Populists faced the problem of endorsing Bryan or choosing their own candidate and splitting the free silver vote; they compromised by nominating Bryan for president and their own candidate for vice-president.

Despite his eloquence and energy, Bryan succeeded in capturing only the south and the west. Even in these areas, his success was incomplete — Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Kentucky, California and Oregon went Republican.

Mark Hanna and McKinley won the battle, but the cheap money advocates won the campaign. New discoveries (Australia, South Africa, the Klondike) led to increased production of gold and new techniques made profitable the use of low-grade ores. Gold output in 1897 was twice that of 1890, production in 1898 reached two and a half times the 1890 figure. The price level rose; poor harvests abroad and good ones at home assuaged agricultural discontent. The free silver issue lost its vote appeal as economic conditions improved; in 1900 Congress definitely placed the country on the gold standard.

Although temporarily dormant, the silverites awaited another opportunity. This came 18 years later, in response to heavy demands for silver from India and from Great Britain (which owed large balances to India and the Orient). The Pittman Act of 1918 permitted the Treasury to dispose of 350,000,000 silver dollars held in reserve for silver certificates. Federal Reserve Bank notes would substitute for the silver certificates but, at the end of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the emergency, the silver dollars transferred from the Treasury were to be replaced with dollars coined from silver. Thus, instead of disposing of part of its unnecessary silver stock, the Treasury was forced to buy new silver at the highest price in years. This creation of a market for silver producers meant the Treasury paid $70,000,000 more for new silver than it received for the old.

THOMAS AMENDMENT

The next act begins with the first Roosevelt administration. Again, a depression provided the lever for monetary action. Cessation of business activity, rapidly declining prices and mounting unemployment made action by the new administration imperative. To many, the answer to economic depression seemed simple—raise prices.

The inflationist philosophy was embodied in the Thomas Amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. This action authorized the President to issue greenbacks, permit free coinage of silver, provide for Federal Reserve purchases of government securities on the open market, and reduce the gold content of the dollar.

While the President chose the latter alternative, the silver interests were not forgotten. The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 directed the Secretary of the Treasury to buy silver at home and abroad "at such times, rates and terms as the Secretary deems to be in the public interest," except that the purchase price could not exceed the monetary value or be greater than 50c per ounce for silver located in continental U. S. on May 1, 1934. Purchases were to continue until the value of the government's silver holdings equaled one-third of its gold stock or until the market price of silver soared to $1.29 an ounce. When, and if, the price exceeded that figure or the stock of silver exceeded 25 per cent of the metallic reserve, silver could be sold by the government. The lessons of the Bland-Allison Act and the Sherman Silver Purchase Act had been taken to heart!

The Treasury bought $3,000,000,000 of silver from 1934 to 1942. In 1934 alone, it acquired 113,000,000 ounces of domestically held silver, nationalized by presidential action, at 50.01c per ounce; and 185,000,000 ounces on the open market at varying prices. In 1935 it bought 543,800,000 ounces and in 1935, 381,200,000.

With the new market provided by government purchases, domestic silver production increased. The world market price rose to 64.5c in April, 1935—the Treasury increased its purchase price to 71.11c. When speculation further raised the market price, the Treasury kept pace by boosting its offer to 77.57c. Again the market price rose, but this time the Treasury remained firm — by December, 1936, the market price had dropped to 45c.

As a result of this policy, the country gained an enormous amount of unneeded and, perhaps, unwanted metal and, in the eyes of many, laid the basis for future monetary troubles. The expectation that the increased price of silver would lead to its wider use as a standard of value proved unfounded. Our policy played havoc with nations using sil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ver standards and helped eliminate possible foreign markets. Thus, China, Honk Kong, Mexico, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Ecuador, Columbia, Peru and Iran were forced to adjust their monetary systems to American policy. The silver freed by their actions swelled the total available for purchase; China, which had protested vigorously against the effects of American purchases, changed from a normal buyer of 92,000,000 ounces a year to a seller of 275,000,000 ounces and left the silver standard in 1935. In addition, silver producing countries benefitted heavily because our increased demands at subsidized prices made increased output highly profitable. This in turn financially aided certain American interests since, in 1929, an estimated 66 per cent of the world's total mine output and 73 per cent of the world's refinery output of silver was controlled by United States capital.

"In general, our silver purchases have constituted an unmeasured dissemination of purchasing power by America to silver sellers everywhere. It has been a share-the-wealth movement of little rhyme or reason, an unscientific charity. If redistribution of purchasing power abroad has been our real objective, results could much better have been achieved by increased merchandise imports, accompanied by reduction of our import tariffs." (Bratter, H. M., *Effects of the Silver Program at Home and Abroad,* p. 8.)

At the same time, the goal of a 1:3 ratio remained far away even though most of the free silver in the world has already been bought by the Treasury. The government's gold policy and the influx from Europe made our holdings of gold more than keep pace with the increased acquisition of silver—this in turn meant increased purchases of silver.

". . . a powerful 'political bloc' internally bent on raiding the U. S. Treasury in order to obtain subsidies for their constituents . . . has been so powerful politically, that since 1933 there has been a law on the statute books which permits the President of the United States at his discretion to place the U. S. upon a bimetallic standard. . . . The silver policy was condemned from its inauguration by American economists and today there should be no doubt even in the minds of the layman that it is a failure. . . . It is ridiculous to continue to subsidize international silver production, since it is mined largely as a by-product of copper and other base metals. For political reasons it may be necessary to continue to purchase the silver output of domestic mines, but even this compromise is subject to serious objections and can be justified only on the most selfish political grounds. . . . Probably the future of our silver hoard, which is physically about the same size as the Washington Monument, depends upon some chemical discovery that will put it to use for some purpose now unknown." (Prather, C. L., *Money and Banking,* pp. 144, 167.)

The last act saw silver in the headlines again. A nation at war was desperately short of metals. High on the critical list was copper; for many war purposes, silver could be substituted for copper. The Treasury had 1,350,000,000 ounces of "free" silver, that is, silver neither pledged against our standing currency nor used in coins. The problem then arose, how to convert the free silver to war work?

The Attorney-General ruled that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Treasury could lend-lease unpledged silver for use in war plants. The Secretary of Treasury and the Defense Plants Corporation agreed that the 1,350,000,000 ounces would be loaned and leased to replace copper in bus bars and in other forms where the silver would not be "consumed." Only a small portion, however, went from West Point to war.

The Treasury, to speed up industrial utilization, was willing to sell its free silver at cost—48.69c per ounce. Congress acted. It raised the legal price of the free silver to 71.1c per ounce. The silver bloc removed the danger that industry would be able to use "cheap" silver instead of the newly mined domestic metal.

The official explanation for this action is slightly different. Said Senator Green of Rhode Island: "The silver producers want to keep the price at 71c for sentimental reasons. They feel there is a certain psychological value in keeping the price at that figure and it really isn't as important as you think. The Treasury makes a profit, and it really doesn't make much difference which pocket the Treasury takes its money into and pays it out of." A further suggestion was made by the silver interests: Raise the price of silver to $1.29 an ounce. This, it was claimed, would stimulate silver production; in mining silver, copper is often found — more silver, more copper, less of a shortage. This new thought, however, remained in the realm of speculation.

With the war over and W.P.B. controls lifted, industry is resuming its utilization of silver. Demand is heavy in such fields as electrical goods, photographic and laboratory equipment, medicines and jewelry. In particular, the demand for the lower-priced foreign silver, hitherto confined to essential users, is heavy and in excess of supply. With the situation expected to continue tight throughout 1946, O.P.A. increased ceilings for foreign silver to stimulate shipments to the U. S. This they did in a generous manner—authorizing an increase from 45 to 71.1c per ounce.

The silver bloc remains hungry, however. Only recently, Senator McCarran of Nevada renewed demands for a price of $1.29 for domestic silver in letters to President Truman, Secretary Vinson, Secretary Byrnes and Price Administrator Bowles. He further suggested that ceilings on foreign silver be completely abandoned.

What will be the epilogue to this drama of a strong, well-knit pressure group? While one can scarcely predict the answer, it seems certain that it will provide further lessons in economics. Economists will denounce the follies of our silver legislation, but our silver policy will be decided without giving their criticisms much consideration. The decision will depend basically upon two factors: the general condition of economic life and the line-up of opposing forces in Congress. These will determine the ability of the silver bloc to wield the balance of power and to gain the support of other groups to whom silver subsidies are but a means to their own ends.

• Some salesmen electrify their prospects; others merely gas them.
—Franklin Field

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is of the very nature of institutions to become rigid and conservative

What is the Matter With Us?

By Theodore M. Greene

Professor of Philosophy, Princeton University

THE social and spiritual predicament in which we find ourselves today is, in its essence, not unprecedented. It is the perennial predicament of man as a free moral agent, able both to destroy and to create, to hate or to love, to go to the devil, individually and collectively, or to achieve salvation. The crisis of our culture differs from other crises, in our own and in other cultures, chiefly in two respects—first, in the fact that science and technology have enormously extended our reach, and therefore our ability to produce either good or evil, and in the fact that modern methods of communication enable more people to be more aware of the gravity of the present crisis. But fundamentally ours is the age-old problem of mankind. How can we keep ourselves from destroying ourselves? How can we put our great knowledge and power to creative rather than destructive use?

The second world war, following a world-wide depression of unprecedented severity, which, in turn, succeeded the first world war to end all wars, was brought to a dramatic end primarily by the atomic bomb. This bomb has frightened many people into a mood of anxious reflection. But their anxiety has not been very acute and their reflection not very profound. A large majority of editorial writers, for example, have been chiefly worried lest a nation potentially hostile to us, such as Russia, learn how to manufacture the bomb and use it against us, on the uncritical assumption that there is no danger of our putting the bomb to improper use.

Meanwhile, our very natural pre-occupation with the bomb has blinded us to the enormously greater danger which will threaten us all if the victorious nations fail to set up some sort of effective international order—an order effective not only in policing the world but in international legislation, administration and judicial decision. Failure in this constructive task will make the failure to keep the atomic bomb in our exclusive possession a relatively unimportant detail, despite the incredible power of this new instrument of destruction.

Even the successful establishment of effective international machinery for peace, however, would not, by itself, get us out of our real predicament. For this predicament is fundamentally cultural, moral and spiritual in the largest sense. Our most basic problems are these: (1) How can we preserve what is really valuable in our western culture and keep from lapsing into a more and more uncultured barbarism? (2)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How can we develop and strengthen that moral sense which is requisite to an understanding of a genuine interest in others and a willingness to cooperate with our fellow men? (3) How can we recapture what we have so largely lost—a knowledge of and a belief in spiritual forces more righteous than we are and capable of evoking our awe, veneration and obedience?

Barbarism can be defined as the loss, or the absence, of all that makes human existence distinctively human, and human life worth living. When General Eisenhower announced that the life of one American soldier was worth more than any historic monument in Italy, his announcement was hailed by nearly everyone in this country as wise and right. In a sense he was right, in the sense, namely, that art does exist for man and not man for art. But suppose he had been confronted with the dreadful possibility of being able to save a million lives at the cost of our *entire* cultural heritage—of *all* our art and music, our literature and philosophy, our knowledge of history and human society, our science, and, finally, our whole body of religious traditions and beliefs. Would a decision to save even a million young lives have been worth *that* price?

VALUE OF FOUR FREEDOMS

If we answer, yes, then the question arises as to what we were actually fighting for. Was it for our democratic institutions and the four freedoms which these institutions are designed to preserve? If so, are these institutions and these freedoms so intrinsically valuable that the mere possession of them will suffice to make life good? We can agree that economic distress is bad and that freedom from want is good. But man needs more than economic security, or even plenty, to live well as a man. Fear is bad and freedom from fear is ardently to be sought. But mere safety is not enough to give meaning to life. Freedom of speech, and of thought as it expresses itself in speech, is very good, and its loss is undoubtedly a very great evil. But freedom of speech can mean little to a man who has nothing to say and no desire to hear. Freedom to worship, or not to worship, as one wills, is a precious part of our American heritage. But if a society forgets its religious traditions, allows its religious institutions to weaken and die, and finally loses all interest in, or capacity for, religious belief, the whole issue of religious worship becomes a dead issue—as it is today for millions of people in our so-called Christian nation.

Democracy itself, whether political or social, can come to mean very little if the positive values which men can best preserve and promote by democratic means cease to be valuable to them. We tend to think that man is, by his very nature, democratically minded, forgetting that a large majority of the people in the world today have no such desire at all! What they want is an orderly society in which governmental power is directed to protecting rather than exploiting them; they crave a benevolent despotism, as efficiently paternalistic as possible. Our democratic desire to share in the processes and prerogatives of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government is a fairly recent and very unusual cultural phenomenon. It too can weaken and die if it is not safeguarded and nourished.

MISUSE OF GOODS

The question as to how we can preserve what is really valuable in our western culture and avoid slipping back into barbarism is therefore a vital question, and it is one which squarely confronts us today. For it is becoming increasingly clear that most young Americans, despite (or perhaps because of) what they are being taught, have no real conception of what democracy is or what it is worth, no real sense of the human significance of the freedoms of speech and worship, and little if any appreciation of our rich cultural heritage, secular or religious. Those of our institutions which reflect most accurately the cultural level of our society—the newspapers and popular magazines, the movies, the radio, and particularly our advertisements — make very clear what it is that we most cherish as a nation. We value our health and our looks, our houses and cars and all the devices which modern technology has put at our disposal. We value romantic love, and sport, and a national power and prestige of which we can be proud. We admire successful doctors, lawyers, scientists, industrialists and businessmen, whereas teachers, ministers and politicians rank a poor second in our scale of social values. As a nation we are very like that type of society which Plato called an oligarchy, in which wealth and all that produces wealth and all that wealth can buy are most highly prized by the vast majority, even by those who are unsuccessful and poor.

I do not wish to imply that these things which most of us value are bad, or even that they are not positive goods. On the contrary, they are, in and of themselves, real sources of human happiness and well-being. They become harmful and evil only when they are misused, and the easiest way to misuse them, just because they are so good and so enjoyable, is to make them our highest goods and to worship them. The ascetic condemns them because he sees how prone man is to this idolatry. He does not believe that man can escape an idolatry of things save by a radical renunciation of things and of the pleasures which they occasion. Christ was no ascetic, but even he told the rich young man, who was so admirable a young man in so many ways, to give away his wealth because only thus would he be able to achieve salvation. The monastic orders have followed this advice, but the Christian tradition, like Greek idealism, has in general condemned not goods and pleasures but the misuse of goods and the substitution of lesser pleasures for a higher happiness. That has been the central affirmation of our western culture — the affirmation that wisdom is superior to ignorance, beauty to ugliness, temperance and courage to intemperance and cowardice, justice to injustice, love to hate. And this belief, in turn, has been closely associated with our respect for human personality and our resolve to cherish and develop all the institutions, legal and political, medical, educa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional and religious, which can safeguard and promote the good life of the individual.

A society which is in danger of losing this faith and the effectiveness of any of these institutions is indeed in a grave predicament. It can be blinded to this danger, moreover, by the indefinite continuation and even expansion of institutions long after the faith which brought them into being has been largely lost. Society must have its institutions as foci for social cooperation and as vehicles for individual and social action. Yet it is the very nature of institutions to become rigid and conservative, to make people value size and complexity of organization and "practical" efficiency rather than significant originality and spiritual vitality. Eventually this leads to revulsion and repudiation, but it may take a long time for the institution to collapse like a dead tree. Until it does collapse the unobservant are apt to mistake a vast institutional structure for the vitality which should, but no longer does, permeate it, and thus to lapse into a smug complacency.

Many people today are the victims of this illusion as regards the institutions of the church, the school, government and the family. Mercifully, no one of these institutions is dead or nearly dead in our society, but each is exhibiting grave symptoms of a disease which may prove fatal.

Our churches still list millions of members and many thousands of clergy, and the sincere and reasonably enlightened piety of some of these clergymen and laymen endow the churches with such religious vitality as they still possess. Yet the indifference, ignorance, superstition and blind dogmatism to be found in all the Christian sects, major as well as minor, is perfectly evident to anyone who is able to look behind the facades of imposing buildings and large Sunday morning congregations. How much do these services *really* mean to most of those who attend them? How fully do they understand the revolutionary challenge of the Christian Gospel? How well do they know their own Christian tradition? How often can one distinguish the weekday behavior of professing Christians from that of avowed secularists? Honest answers to such questions as these are not wholly negative, but they are certainly not encouraging. Some thoughtful observers are firmly convinced that the Church is dying very rapidly and that it will cease to be an active force in a few decades.

The school still enjoys considerable public support and gives signs of considerable inner vitality. Privately endowed educational institutions are at least holding their own, and tax supported schools, colleges and universities are increasing in number and size. But if we inquire into what is *redlly* being accomplished on these campuses the answer is often discouraging. How effectively are those who never reach the high school level equipped for a useful and happy life in our democratic society? How successful are the so-called liberal arts courses in high school in achieving their purposes? How well do high schools prepare the abler boys and girls for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

college? And to what extent do the many thousands of young people who graduate from college every year give evidence of genuine cultivation and a quickened social conscience? It is easy to be so impressed by the many failures of the school that its notable achievements are forgotten. It is even easier to be unduly complacent about what the school accomplishes, especially in contrast with what it might accomplish, and must accomplish, if it is to perform the truly gigantic task which only it can perform in our society.

It is not hard to point to vast areas of governmental inefficiency and political corruption. More serious is the failure of so many of our citizens to take the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society seriously and to understand or value the prerogatives of democratic control. Witness the political and social indifference and inertia of most of our fellow citizens most of the time. Witness also their general inability to share in Wendell Wilkie's vision of one world in which we can no longer live independent of or indifferent to what goes on in other nations and peoples.

Finally, the family still exerts a powerful cohesive and moulding force in our society. Yet its influence is rapidly waning, and, more important, the quality and direction of this influence often is positively harmful rather than beneficial. The rapidly rising divorce rate is only a symptom of a social trend. The genuine unhappiness in countless families which avoid the shipwreck of divorce is an alarming indication that very many young and older couples do not possess the difficult art of family life. I am well aware of the many exceptions to this widespread failure. But we dare not let these exceptions blind us to the brutal fact that countless married couples are ill-matched, that those best qualified to give children the right kind of home life usually have the fewest children, and that, in general, the influence of the home upon the younger generation is often misguided or even harmful.

It is not my purpose in this and the succeeding articles merely to list and deplore our institutional failures and the gravity of our predicament. I have been so emphatic regarding these failures and the seriousness of the crisis in which we find ourselves in order to explore, as honestly and searchingly as possible, whatever ways and means may be available to us to meet the situation constructively. What can be done to vitalize our churches and schools, our democratic institutions and the family? I shall discuss these questions as best I can in the ensuing articles.

• It was during a bargain sale and tempers were rising.

"If I were trying to match politeness," said the customer to the saleslgirl, "I'd have a hard time finding it here."

The clerk responded: "Will you kindly let me see your sample, madam?"

—*Successful Farming*

• One St. Louis bus driver diplomatically admonishes his passengers with: "Kindly push each other to the rear, please."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last in a series of articles on democracy's historical roots

Can Democracy Be Transplanted?

By C. L. Thompson

BY the reign of William IV it was obvious that the power of government in England had come to rest with the electorate. Thus the power of dissolution had passed gradually from the King to Parliament. The preceding article in the December *Forum* traced this growth in England through William III.

The transfer of authority from the King to the Cabinet became even more obvious under the rule of William IV. His opposition to the Reform Bill of 1832 was widely known. In 1831, when the lords rejected the bill, the Cabinet desired to dissolve Parliament, in order to impress upon the lords and King alike the wishes of the electorate. In spite of the opposition of William IV to the plan, he was forced to yield to his Cabinet and grant a dissolution. For the first time, under William IV, then, the dissolution became the tool not of the King but of the Cabinet, whether it acted for or against the wishes of the King. For the first time, the King was forced openly and definitely to yield to the Cabinet. The Cabinet, and not the King, began to exercise the royal prerogative. After the election, the Cabinet announced:

"A cabinet has been formed which has gathered to itself all effective power, and this power has been or is being handed over to the English people." Parliamentary cabinet government was starting to gain power in England.

In 1832 William made another attempt to regain his lost power by emulating the example of George III. He dismissed Lord Melbourne and his Cabinet, and called Peel into service. Then, in order to secure a Commons in sympathy with the new government, he dissolved Parliament and called for a general election. But he was sadly disappointed. The people were overwhelmingly in favor of Melbourne, and William was forced to bow to their wishes and restore him to office. Instead of increasing the royal power, he decreased it, and lost prestige besides. The lesson learned at this cost was to influence greatly his successors on the throne. Once more, the Cabinet and Commons, rather than the King, controlled the situation.

At the same time, another powerful element had entered the struggle for power through the dissolution of 1784 and 1834—the electorate. "The essential point to notice," writes Dicey, "is that these contests each in effect admitted the principle that it is the verdict of the political sovereign which ultimately determines the right of a Cabinet to remain in office, namely the nation."

By the time that Victoria ascended to the throne, dissolution had ceased for all time to be the personal weapon of the sovereign. Never-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theless, it was still used by the crown in conjunction with the ministry in order to maintain a harmonious House of Commons. Although Victoria had definite favorites among her ministers, she no longer felt able to use the old royal prerogative and dismiss those whom she disliked regardless of the Commons. She made repeated efforts to retain Lord Melbourne as Prime Minister, but even dissolution failed to yield him a majority in Commons, and Victoria was finally forced to accept her hated opposition leader, Gladstone. During Victoria's reign the Commons was dissolved almost exclusively on the advice of her ministers. Although she endeavored to be a strong queen, and had a strong sense of her privileges, Victoria's reign signalled a further growth of parliamentary government.

Although until the end of her reign Victoria maintained that it was her royal prerogative to dissolve or refuse to dissolve Parliament at her own discretion, she was far too conscious of the dangers involved to undertake such actions. Thus the royal right of dissolution, which was exercised so autocratically during the reigns of the Tudors and the Stuarts, and with discretion during the reign of William IV, fell into disuse as the party system and consequent cabinet government developed in England, until at the end of the century it became part of the great never-used prerogatives of the English sovereign.

Although politicians and constitutional lawyers tried to persuade King George V to use the dissolution during the Irish issue in 1913, he refused. His reign was characterized by quiet adherence to parliamentary principles, and during that period the cabinet form of government gained full power. The proof of this is seen in the abdication of Edward VIII on the advice of his ministers. This would seem to offer convincing evidence that the day when the monarch turned out the ministry and dissolved the Parliament at his pleasure is over in Britain. The King will not act thus even if in refraining from such action he gives up his throne. The power of dissolution in England, in view of historical events, seems to have developed through three phases. From being a weapon in the hands of absolute kings, it became a tool shared by the King and his ministers, usually used by the King to aid cabinet policies. During this second period the King and ministers frequently struggled over dissolutions, and the struggle usually brought victory to the ministers. Finally, the dissolution became a method used by the Cabinet to control Commons, while the King's part became advisory only. Even in Great Britain the dissolution in the hands of the Cabinet may be anti-democratic, since the threat of dissolution may coerce an obstinate Commons. Yet established tradition safeguards the British electorate.

DIFFICULTIES OF TRANSPLANTING

We have devoted so much space to the history of dissolution in Great Britain because the adaptation of this executive power led to great weakening of the German parliamentary system, just as its elimination greatly weakened the French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

executive. The difficulty, of course, lies partly in the curious and tedious development of the British dissolution through custom rather than law. Perhaps more important for this discussion is the difficulty of transplanting such a custom-rooted tradition to an alien soil, however favorable for democracy. The French and Germans had an entirely different historical background: to adapt the outward form of the British system to their countries without an understanding of the tradition and custom governing it was pre-destined to failure.

Because the framers of the German constitution did not understand the background of the British system and because they lacked tradition that would safe-guard majority will and minority rights, the German constitution contained provisions for dissolution and executive emergency powers never used in modern Britain: provisions which permitted the constitutional establishment of dictatorship. There is no written law in Great Britain that prohibits the executive (Crown) from violating minority rights. The German constitution, like the American as amended, listed the rights of citizens at great length, but it failed to protect these rights from a dictatorial executive and Reichstag. In Great Britain the weight of custom and common law protect the citizen: in the United States, largely though custom, protection of minorities is a function of the Supreme Court.

This writer is convinced that no matter how carefully a democratic constitution is worked out, the form alone will not and cannot make democracy work.

Like the British, on whose traditions they drew, the American people slowly developed a concept of political democracy. The British colonists sought in America either religious liberty or economic independence. The reign of the Tudors, the Stuarts and the Protector were turbulent. Dynastic changes and religious feuds were accompanied by confiscation of estates and deportations. Some of the dispossessed came to America. Convicts as well as political prisoners were sent to the colonies. Many religious non-conformists left England because their particular sect happened to be out of favor, rather than because they believed in religious freedom.

COLONIAL EXPERIENCE

The Quakers were convinced believers in religious freedom. Lord Baltimore, Catholic proprietor of Maryland, like William Penn, made definite efforts to establish it in his province. The difficulties in New England, of which the persecution of Roger Williams is an outstanding example, gradually convinced the Calvinists of the value of true religious freedom.

Great estates were characteristic of the South. They were worked by indentured servants and by slaves. The difficulty of competition by small farmers with great planters early made economic and political equality an issue in Virginia and to a lesser degree, in Georgia. The middle states and New England found the restrictions put upon their trade by the mercantile policies of England onerous.

Democracy in New England developed from the non-conformist churches and the town meetings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taxation was obviously a burning question in local government. The belief that the best government is the least government was a national outgrowth of the desire to avoid taxes, although it was most clearly expressed by Thomas Jefferson rather than by a New Englander.

The colonies were small units. The inequities and the inefficiency inherent in all continuing organizations were therefore obvious. Since the government and the churches were the principal existent organizations, they were distrusted. There were no organizations outside the government except the churches powerful enough to need curbing, so the American need for governmental control was relatively small. In England control of the government had long vested in a widening group of special interests. First the King had been curbed by the barons. Then the importance of the mercantile classes in the towns gave the towns their charters. But the widening powers of the government had been used for the benefit of a slowly increasing privileged class, rather than for the nation as a whole. The colonists, when they left England, had not been in the privileged group of the moment and so started to America with a complete distrust of government.

The separation of church and state is obviously desirable to any man who belongs to a minority religion. Tithes in England and New England had been paid to the dominant church so the non-conformists of the moment had to support both the state church and their own. Taxes in England had originally been paid in kind to the King. As late as the time of William Rufus the King periodically moved the court from place to place so it could consume the taxes. The right to avoid taxes was at times almost as desirable as the right to collect them.

Parliament originated as an advisory body for the King. It gradually attained the right to tax. Its laws were enforced by the courts. The judges were subservient at times to the King and at times to the Parliament. Any combination of King and Church, King and Army, King and Parliament inevitably led to serious abuses, but the most serious abuses came when King, Parliament and courts were united. Those colonists who were primarily democratic therefore determined that the executive, legislature and the courts should be kept separate at all costs. Obviously they were opposed to centralized government, and the division of powers would make centralized government hard to obtain.

The Constitution, even with the separation of powers, could not have been ratified without the inclusion of the "Bill of Rights", again showing the distrust by the people of the country of the institution of government.

Perhaps the ablest group that ever set out to frame a government was the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Included in its membership were George Washington and John Marshall of Virginia.

General Washington may have foreseen that he was to be the first President and that if no time limitation was put on the duration of the office by the Constitution, he could limit it by custom. But this is completely out of character. More

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely he saw the necessity for a limitation of power by limiting the presidency to two terms in terms of his personal dislike for the abuse showered upon him, but in either case he established a limitation which tended to divide executive and legislative more effectively than any planned separation of powers. Neither John Marshall nor the group foresaw the use that the Chief Justice was to make of the Bill of Rights as the basis for his complete check of the executive by the Court.

Nor did he see that if the term of the presidency might become unlimited in length one president might appoint all the members of the Court.

Nor could Thomas Jefferson at the time of the acceptance of the Constitution foresee that a day would come when he would, as president of the United States, purchase Louisiana, or that one of his successors would say: "John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it."

The popular election of the President and the American party system are examples of custom, not constitutional law.

If an adaptation of British and American democracy worked none too well in France, where democratic tradition was strong, and failed in Germany, where there was at least a small group of democrats, it is even less likely to succeed in Japan. In Japan, we are faced with an entirely different social, political and cultural history, a strong tradition by no means democratic, different economic problems. A satisfactory government for Japan can be worked out only by the Japanese and only in line with their own culture and philosophy, not ours. This is not to say that the Japanese or the Germans, or for that matter the Russians, may not adapt some parts of western democratic forms to their governments. But it is foolish to expect or demand that the pattern resemble ours. If the Japanese or the Germans really want democracy, they will work out some kind of democratic pattern to fit their culture: if they do not, no occupation armies can impose a democratic form that will force democracy upon them.

The occupation armies can, however, maintain order in Japan and Germany and can perhaps destroy the economic military potential of these nations temporarily. It is hard to believe that truly democratic elements in a defeated nation can be strengthened by an alliance with the armies of the victors. The northern occupation of the South after the Civil War, the German occupation of western Europe and the Russian occupation of the "satellite" states are more nearly what can be expected to happen.

• A group of eighth-grade girls were discussing their autobiographies to be written for a school assignment. One, age 13, protested: "'I don't see how I can write one. I don't remember a thing about my childhood."

• Rural residents looking to the future are making heavy plantings of trees about their homes, perhaps as a defense against city relatives who may "drop in" for Sunday dinner in their post-war helicopters.

—*Kansas City Star*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first of two articles on population trends

The Shifting Balance of World Population

By Kingsley Davis

Professor of Anthropology and Sociology, Princeton University

TODAY the earth's population is growing at the fastest pace ever known. Also, new and extreme inequalities of growth are developing as between nations. Each of these facts poses grave problems for all mankind, not merely two thousand years hence but now. The rapidity of growth brings into question, for example, the world's food supply, a question of today. The changing inequality of growth calls to mind the world's shifting power relations, an obstacle to peace.

Fortunately, impending events cast their shadows before them in the field of population—more clearly perhaps than in any other social realm. Demographic trends manifest such regularity that when the basic figures are known, systematic estimates can be made 20 to 50 years in advance; and recent research has added greatly to the techniques of estimating. Consequently one can speak with confidence and in non-technical language about the outstanding changes in world population — changes that possess great political and social significance.

At present approximately 2,200,000,000 people inhabit the earth. Despite depression and war these myriads are multiplying so rapidly that every ten years approximately 175,000,000, or considerably more than the entire population of the United States, are being added. If such a rate continues, the year 2000 —a time when our children will still be living—will find the world with substantially more than 3,000,000,000 inhabitants, or half again what it now has. If the earth seems crowded today, how will it seem then?

But will such a rate continue? Obviously not. The growth must stop sometime, because if the present geometric pace were to last until the year 2240 the earth would hold 21,000,000,000 people, a number generally held to be impossible. The question then is not *if* the growth will continue, but *when* and *how* it will stop.

The stimulus that set off the unprecedented growth of population in modern times was the Industrial Revolution, which enabled greater numbers to support themselves with less effort. Its effect can be seen in the following figures:

	Estimated World Population (Millions)	*Annual Per Cent Growth in Prior Period*
1650	545	. . .
1750	728	0.29
1800	906	0.44
1850	1,171	0.51
1900	1,608	0.63
1940	2,171	0.75

Clearly the growth rate has accelerated. In the two centuries between 1650 and 1850 the world population doubled, but in only the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one century between 1850 and 1950 it is doubling again.

This acceleration doubtless arises from the spread of industrial civilization. The industrial regime first stimulated growth at its point of origin—Europe. But its subsequent diffusion to other regions extended its influence around the globe. For the first time the world's entire population responded as a single entity to one great social change. For the first time the movement of human masses across large oceans became feasible. For the first time a new type of balance between births and deaths, a balance less wasteful than the old, began to manifest itself.

INDUSTRIALIZATION AND LESS DEATHS

Since nothing can alter the world's numbers except as it affects fertility and mortality, the Industrial Revolution must have either increased births or decreased deaths. The evidence all indicates that it did the latter. No proof is available that in any significant part of the world birth rates have risen. On the contrary, there is plenty of proof that in the most advanced countries fertility has declined. In Europe as a whole there was apparently a tendency toward decline in the nineteenth century. The drop gathered speed as time went on, slackening only after 1933.

If birth rates did not rise, but fell instead, then the expansion of population must have come from a decline in mortality—a decline great enough not only to compensate for lowered fertility but also to furnish a greater natural increase than ever before. The recorded statistics prove that this was the case, for in the now industrialized countries the average expectation of life has almost doubled since the seventeenth century.

The reduction in mortality was at first gradual, and began primarily with a more abundant, regular and varied food supply, which came with peace and commercial expansion. Protection from disease through public sanitation and scientific medicine did not take effect until about the beginning of the nineteenth century, and was tragically slow during the next 50 years. It eventually did have a remarkable effect, however, lowering the already reduced mortality still farther. In northwestern Europe the decline reached its fastest pace during the half century from 1880 to 1930.

Behind the revolutionary increase in longevity there was the general and all-inclusive change of European society from illiterate agriculturalism to literate industrialism. The change took centuries and even in Europe is still incomplete. Yet the decline in mortality was not merely a result, but also a cause, of the social transformation, for it facilitated a more efficient use of human energies.

Though fertility also declined, it did so more slowly than mortality. A curious fact of human behavior is that, in the transition to a modern regime based on fewer babies and longer lives, the decline of fertility lags behind that of mortality. Because of this lag, the early phases of industrial progress are always marked by an astounding increase in numbers. But when the competitive, individualistic, urban society has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arisen as a result of this industrial progress, large families become a handicap rather than a blessing. Then the same rational approach that was applied to the limitation of deaths is also applied to the limitation of births, and the population ceases to grow. A balance is once again achieved, but it is a different and more efficient balance.

For instance, the European population after 1800 tripled itself, at the same time that it sent millions overseas. Yet as the birth rate dropped to lower levels, northwestern and central Europe reached a point in 1930-1940 when the growth of population began once more to approach zero. Indeed, such growth as remains is more apparent than real, because there is still an abnormal number of people in the reproductive ages; but statistical analysis shows that a stationary or a declining population will soon eventuate. Mortality has been reduced so far already that further reductions can no longer compensate for lowered fertility.

Thus in advanced areas such as Europe and places where Europeans settled, the Industrial Revolution has been accompanied by an intimately related demographic transition, representing an astounding gain in human efficiency. Under the old regime of high fertility and high mortality, women experienced the drain and danger of pregnancy often to no purpose, because a large proportion of the offspring died before reaching maturity. Too much effort was spent in trying to bring each new generation to adulthood; too much energy lost in sickness, malnutrition and mourning; too much time taken for mere sustenance. The new type of demographic balance released a large part of this energy for other things.

By virtue of having originated the industrial and demographic transition, European peoples acquired the means for world dominance. They increased at a much more rapid rate than the rest of the world. Within three centuries they multiplied themselves more than seven times, while the other peoples increased only three times. In 1650 the Europeans numbered about 100,000,000; in 1933, scattered throughout the world, they numbered approximately 720,000,000, of whom some 200,000,000 lived outside Europe. Their proportion of the world's population rose from 18 per cent at the earlier date to 35 per cent at the later one.

This numerical expansion was accompanied by an enormous geographical expansion. Between 1846 and 1932, the period of greatest migration, more than 50,000,000 Europeans went overseas, most of them permanently. Thus both the stock and the culture were transplanted to huge new continental and island areas. Displacing sparse native populations, the Europeans applied their advanced arts to agriculture and eventually to industry.

Regions settled by *northwestern* Europeans — Australia, New Zealand and North America — traversed the cycle of modernization more rapidly than any ever known, but reached the point of potential stability or decline in a shorter time. In regions where the native population was more abundant, and particularly where the transplanted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culture was Spanish or Portuguese, the transition was less rapid. In Latin America, for example, the people remained more agricultural and population grew more slowly, although today this region is in the rapid growth phase.

Even when the Europeans did not settle in large numbers, they nevertheless exerted their dominance and spread their culture. In Asia, for instance, they found native civilizations of a complex type, with populations already massive in size. By armed conquest or sharp bargaining they managed to dominate these peoples politically and economically. Using their capital and skill they organized trade in the ports and commercial agriculture in the hinterland. The native peoples served as a rural proletariat, working often for bare subsistance, serving in a dependent capacity.

ASIATIC LAG

The economic position of the Asiatics has tended to retard a balanced absorption of western civilization. Certain elements have been absorbed rapidly, others slowly. The techniques of reducing death rates have been imported to some extent. Birth rates, however, have not been correspondingly reduced, first because birth control proved a less acceptable feature of western culture, and second because the Asiatics remained a rural proletariat with hardly any motive to reduce fertility.

This fact—the one-sided diffusion of westernism to Asia—tends to aggravate the usual lag of fertility behind mortality. On the other hand, the fact that industrial civilization is already highly developed in other areas and does not have to pass through a long process of evolution as it did in Europe, means that the usual lag might be reduced. But whether it will be aggravated or minimized in the future, there is today an increasing gap between fertility and mortality, with the inevitable result, the commencement of a gigantic expansion of the Asiatic population — the first phase of a growth cycle apparently similar to that which the Europeans are just completing. Since there are already teeming millions in Asia, the future increments will be staggering. Coming at a time when the western peoples are reaching a stationary point, the increase will greatly raise the proportion of Asiatics in the world.

It becomes clear, then, that the Europeans, by originating the Industrial Revolution and spreading it to the rest of the world, have enormously strengthened their position but have finally laid the basis for a possible weakening of it. Whereas they formerly enjoyed a rising dominance, they now face an imminent decline in world power.

Strictly speaking, not all European peoples are in the same boat. It is possible, as Notestein and Thompson have done, to classify all countries into three types: (1) Those of "'incipient decline" who have already passed the cycle of rapid growth, whose birth and death rates have both fallen to very low levels, and whose populations are therefore likely to decline or remain stationary during the next few decades. This class includes the United States, Canada, Australia,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Zealand and all of Europe except the southeastern region and Russia. (2) Those of "transitional growth" who are in an earlier stage of the industrial cycle, whose birth rates are still high but declining, and who, after a steep increase in the next few decades, will thereafter reach a point of stability or decline. This class includes, among others, Russia, Japan and southeastern Europe. (3) Those of "high potential growth" who have still to become industrialized and hence can anticipate, under conditions of peace and economic expansion, an exceedingly long and fast growth based on traditionally high birth rates and improved mortality, but who, under conditions of political disruption and continued poverty, may have virtually no growth at all. This class includes India, China, Netherlands Indies, most of Africa and South America.

Such a classification can be roughly made, but our knowledge of specific countries is far more exact with reference to the first two classes than with reference to the last. For instance, the population projections in the recent League of Nations publication, *The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union* by Notestein and others, give us a basis for estimating future trends. Other scholars, both in official and unofficial capacities, have made projections based on certain assumptions for various countries including the United States. In what follows these projections have been utilized to form some idea of what is likely to happen, with such allowance as the writer thinks necessary for war losses and other contingencies not included in the specific assumptions made in these technical works.

In one country of the first type (France) the decline of population, apart from immigration, has already begun. In others (Great Britain, Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden) it will probably begin in 10 or 20 years. In the remainder the turning point will apparently occur still later—in some cases not until the 1980's or 1990's. Regardless of these differences, the countries of Class I are all in a similar situation. They formerly enjoyed the greatest share of world power and experienced the fastest growth of population. Now, however, they face a decline of relative power as well as growth. At present they contain approximately 400,000,000 people. By 1970 they will likely have hardly any more than that. Their share of the world's population will, therefore, it appears, decrease substantially.

Of the countries of "incipient decline," the United States is among the most favorably situated. Her current population slightly exceeds 140,000,000. According to recent estimates by Thompson and Whelpton, based on medium assumptions, the 1970 figure will be 157,000,000; the peak will occur in 1985 with 161,000,000, then the population will gradually decline. Nobody pretends that these estimates will actually materialize in detail, but the trend they represent seems highly probable. The United States will be far behind Russia, China and India in numbers. Yet the fact that our area is second only to that of Russia and Brazil, and our technology second to none, will make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the population sufficient for strong national power. Still it is certain that as time goes on we can depend less and less upon sheer numbers, or indeed upon industrial advantage, but must depend instead on good will and diplomatic skill.

Germany's demographic prospects are much poorer than ours. Even if her fangs are not drawn, even if her economy is not muzzled, she is still destined for a lesser role in world affairs. Up to 1910 she had the highest birth rate in northwestern and central Europe, but by 1933 one of the lowest. If the 1933 rates had remained fixed she would eventually have begun losing 30 per cent of her population each generation. The Nazis introduced an elaborate population program and succeeded in raising the birth rate. Yet the change was so limited that the best that could have been expected was an ultimately stationary population. With probably the highest proportional war losses of any belligerent nation, with a reduced generation of children to take the place of those who have died, with no prospect of a very high fertility, Germany will likely have fewer people in 1970 than she had when she began World War II.

Few western nations can take comfort from this fact, for they share a similar prospect. The British Isles face an imminent and almost certain decline, so that without immigration they will probably have less than 45,000,000 (less than Italy today) in 1970. France, without substantial immigration, will be lucky to have 35,000,000. Germany, with perhaps around 60,000,000, will still remain the most populous country in Europe (excluding Russia).

The second class—countries of "transitional growth"—embraces today approximately 435,000,000 people, but by 1970 it may well exceed 550,000,000. These are the countries whose demographic power will increase most rapidly. The most important are Russia and Japan.

"TRANSITIONAL GROWTH" NATIONS

Two centuries ago Russia, at least the European part, had fewer inhabitants than did France. Today, with more than 170,000,000, she has over four times the population of France and over twice that of Germany. By 1970 she will have, according to the projections of the Office of Population Research, something like 250,000,000. Even allowing for current war losses, she seems destined to have about three and a half times the population of Germany by 1970. Because of past high fertility she has extremely large numbers of children. As this generation reaches maturity, the number of babies born will be tremendous and will more than compensate for war deaths. Russia can recover from her war losses more easily than any other Allied nation.

In this war Russia's demographic superiority over Germany asserted itself. In the future it will become still greater. This, combined with startling technological advances and a fuller utilization of rich resources, will make her the true giant among nations. Among the present nations of the world her only possible rivals will be the United States, China,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India and the British Empire. Of these, China and India will probably lag behind in technology, resources and political unity, so that the very size of their populations will be a handicap. The British Empire, apart from India, does not amount to much demographically, despite its huge area. Its population growth will be slight and its future unity is by no means guaranteed. The United States remains the only real contender, and it will be handicapped by a much smaller population and a lesser domain. On the other hand, we do not run a serious risk of overpopulation, which is a possibility in Russia.

The Japanese also belong to Class II. Among all the Asiatic peoples they are the only ones to get far in the transition to a modern demographic pattern. In 1870 they were an agrarian people, isolated in their island kingdom and numbering only 35,000,000. By a series of rapid and successful wars they quickly acquired an empire. By 1940 their homeland population had grown to 73,000,000, the empire population to 105,000,000. This was fast growth, the result of rapid industrialization and urbanization, with mortality declining before fertility. The growth resembled that of England in the nineteenth century. But now, leaving aside the unpredictable effects of the war, the very same industrialization and urbanization show an unmistakable tendency to force fertility ever lower, until a stationary population can be predicted in a not too distant future.

One sure effect of the recent war on the Japanese will be the loss of their empire. This will make them once more dependent on the home islands, and on whatever trade can be secured in a hostile world. The war and its aftermath may cost, all told, as many as 10,000,000 Japanese lives, but since the population is still in the rapid growth phase it will have the capacity to recover easily. The chances are that in 1970, despite everything, there will be over 85,000,000 Japanese on the home islands. The main question is how they will support themselves, for there will be far too many of them on the narrow home islands. Without arms, with few resources, with no empire, with powerful neighbors on every side, the Japanese, like the Germans, will find themselves permanently overshadowed.

CLASS III

Chile, Argentina, southeastern Europe and possibly one or two other areas also belong to Class II. But by far the major portion of the world, including 60 per cent of the area and over 60 per cent of the population, belongs to Class III. This is the class with the most uncertain future, because everything depends on the kind of social and economic conditions that will prevail. If the extremely high mortality is brought down, the even higher fertility will yield tremendous growth.

Some of the Class III regions—such as most of South America—have plenty of room for expansion. These can absorb a heavy population growth and at the same time raise their standard of living. But others—such as India, Java and Egypt—have already grown until swarming

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millions are crowded on the land. India alone added 83,000,000 to its population during the 20 years between 1921 and 1941. If political stability and economic progress continue in these regions, they will have fantastic numbers. Indeed, their density is already so great that it seems unsafe to predict peaceful progress. If internal strife should break out, if existing health services should be disrupted, transport ruined, irrigation destroyed, and trade upset, the result might be such a resurgence of high mortality that huge numbers would be wiped out. The potentiality for rapid increase is there, but its realization is highly uncertain. It may be that the industrial revolution will not come to these areas until the surplus population has been eliminated by catastrophe. Even so, modernization may ultimately be expected, and will bring large gains in numbers.

By way of summarizing this discussion of national destiny, let us glance at the relative positions of the great powers in 1940 and 1970, omitting (because of their uncertainty) those that fall in Class III. Taking the leading six and expressing their populations as a percentage of the combined total, one gets the following:

	1940	1970
U.S.S.R.	32.5%	39.6%
U.S.A.	24.5	25.0
Japan	13.6	13.5
Germany	12.9	9.5
Gr. Brit.	8.8	6.8
France	7.7	5.5
	100.0%	100.0%

If these "best guesses" for 1970 are roughly accurate, Russia will enhance her demographic position much more than any other country. The United States and Japan will hold their own. Germany, Great Britain and France will lose heavily. These changes do not necessarily imply similar shifts in national power, but they are an important element.

(*Mr. Davis will conclude this discussion on population in the February* FORUM.)

• A man with a suitcase chased the train to the end of the platform, but failed to catch it.

As he slowly walked back, mopping his brow, an interested onlooker remarked, "Miss the train?"

"Not much," was the reply. "You see, I never got to know it very well."

—*The Outspan*

• Nature abhors a vacuum. When a head lacks brains, she fills it with conceit.

—*Grit*

• A couple of soldiers in the Infantry Replacement Training Center at Camp Croft, South Carolina, inspired by the alphabetic abbreviations used by the Army, worked out this history of a soldier's career in the Army, using every letter in the alphabet: 1-A, RC, IQ, PX, KP, TS, SNAFU, IRTC, BN, ITB, GFU, AWOL, MY, CM, JA, PBY, POM, POE, APO, V-1, CDD, PH, DSC, X1, USA, HOME.

—*Yank*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can we afford to abolish the O.P.A.?

Will Rents Soar Again?

By Sylvia F. Porter

From her column in The New York Post

I ASK all the forces fighting to kill the O.P.A. and rent controls to do only one thing—study a little history. I ask them just to read through the following analysis of what happened to rents after the First World War and then to justify their stand on any other basis except utter self interest. Remember, the parallel between 1919 and today is perilously close.

During the First World War, when prices were under control, the rise in rents was held to 4.9 per cent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

That was an impressive record considering the 61.8 per cent increase in the general cost of living. And it literally saved millions of low and middle-income Americans from misery and homelessness.

But after the Armistice, when price regulations were abandoned, the lid on rents was blown off with such fury that the entire war-time achievement was wiped out.

In 1919 alone, for instance, rents jumped 13 per cent on an average.

In 1920, while the nation was going through a sharp post-war depression, rents continued in an upward spiral and chalked up an additional 20 per cent increase.

In 1921, when we were in our third year of peace, rents swung up another 8 per cent.

By 1922, the rent index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was at 154.4, compared with 104.9 on the first Armistice Day in 1918 and with 100 in July, 1914.

Think of it—a rise of 47 per cent after the war. And think what that meant to the millions looking for places to live, the millions compelled to spend what was demanded for shelter, for food, for clothing.

It won't happen this time? Who says so? And on what basis could any such prediction be made?

Rents today are 3.7 per cent above the levels of September, 1939, the Bureau says.

The index, this time based on the premise that 1935-39 equals 100, is now at 108.3, compared with 104.4 in 1939, with a so-called normal of 100.

So once again, controls have accomplished their purpose. Inflation in at least this major item was prevented during the war.

But every force blowing off the rent lid a quarter-century ago is back today—with double power.

Never have we known so acute a scarcity of apartments and homes. Never has the demand for shelter been so explosive.

Materials are scarce. Manpower is lacking. Strikes and labor-management fights are having the same paralyzing effect.

And the powerful lobbies, the po-

© 1945, by New York Post, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

litical pressures, the usual conflict between the landlords and the tenants—they're all with us just as before.

In the name of logic, then, what will prevent a repetition of 1919-1920-1921 in 1946-1947-1948, outside of government control?

What reason have we to trust that competition among builders and a "strike" among buyers will avert runaway prices any more than competition and a buyers' strike averted runaway prices last time?

In 1919, 400,000 new homes were built by the first men to anticipate the home construction boom.

But buyers couldn't pay the prices demanded for these homes. They had to back away and continue competing for old apartments.

So the building boom was killed in its infancy. In 1920, only 250,000 new houses were constructed. The 20 per cent boost in average rents in that year may be traced directly to the continuing shortages, the fact that rich families were able to outbid wage-eaners for the few places available.

And the home building boom that should have started in 1919 actually didn't get into full swing until 1922.

The parallel is so striking that it sends a shiver down one's spine.

Rent is the second biggest item in the average family's cost of living, taking 20 per cent of its annual income. What's more, the lower the income, usually the larger the percentage spent for shelter.

The man earning $2,000 a year, for instance, uses up a lot more of his income to pay for a roof over his head than the man earning $20,000.

The attack on price controls grows more powerful every day. The ridicule of the O.P.A., the complaints against its policies are aimed directly at killing this agency.

And then what happens to us?

• "Don't be too quick to criticize the candidate who beats around the bush. There may be a voter or two hidden therein."

—Detroit News

• Remember your tongue is a wet place—and likely to slip.

—Watchman-Examiner

• Three monkeys sat in a coconut tree, discussing things as they're said to be. Said one to the others:

"Now, listen, you two, there's a certain rumor that can't be true—that man descends from our Noble Race. The very idea! It's a dire disgrace! No monkey ever deserted his wife, starved her baby and ruined her life. And you've never known a monk mother to leave her babies with others to bunk until they scarcely knew who was their mother. And another thing, you'll never see a monk build a fence 'round a coconut tree and let the coconuts go to waste. Why, if I'd build a fence around this tree, starvation would force you to steal from me! Here's another thing a monk won't do: go out at night and get on a stew; or use a gun, or club or knife to take some other monkey's life.

"Yes, man descended, the ornery cuss—but, brother, he didn't descend from us!"

—Quote

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It's the money of the thing

Beware—Bazaar!

By Sidney J. Harris

From his column in The Chicago Daily News

A MAN never knows where a perfectly innocent step will land him, and that's how I wound up the other night at a "'free" dinner that cost me $35.

When the kind members of the Cordon Club invited me over for a turkey feed "and a few words after dinner," I figured it would be a good chance for the little woman to crawl out from under the gas range for an evening. That was my big mistake.

What the Croydon Club forgot to tell me was that they were holding a bazaar the same night. Had I known this, I would have kept the wife at home locked in a closet, cruel as it sounds.

Once a woman gets the smell of an auction or a bazaar in her nostrils, she runs amok, uttering wild cries of delight and gibbering to herself over the most godawful collection of junk ever seen outside a haunted house. An old brooch that she'd disdainfully toss in the garbage pail at home takes on the aspects of a magic amulet when she spies it at a bazaar.

I am confident that the brooch we bought will quietly disappear next week, and I will find the maid wearing it with her Sunday-go-to-meeting outfit.

The Chinese prints we bought were a pretty good deal, except that it's going to cost us 10 times as much to frame them, and by next spring they'll be swept out of the utility closet and shipped over to the Epworth League bazaar.

By the time we got through buying pillowcases for which we have no pillows, books we haven't the slightest intention of reading, and a pair of battered candleholders that look exactly like the ones we threw out last week, the evening had run me a cool $30. As a kicker, we bought five $1 books of raffle tickets on a doll with 12 changes of clothes.

I'm not complaining, you understand. The dinner was excellent, the company congenial and the bazaar money went for a worthy cause. But the next time they pull a trick like that, the least they could do is warn me. It's not the principle of the thing, it's the money.

• Perhaps the most famous of the Verdun forts is Fort de Vaux. The walls are covered with scribbled names, home towns and dates.

The American names are big and black and seem to blot out the others. One of them says: "Austin White, Chicago, Illinois, 1918 and 1944. This is the last time I want to write my name here."

—*Yank*

© 1945, by The Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Illinois

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shall we appease Ibn Saud?

Dollar Diplomats in Araby?

By Edgar Ansel Mowrer

From his column "Edgar Mowrer on World Affairs" in the New York Post

ONE reason why the American authorities are so loath to fulfill their promises of unrestricted Jewish emigration into Palestine has become clear: during the war, unbeknown to most Americans, we and the British followed a policy of giving "joint assistance" to the Middle Eastern Moslems. Now, although the war is over, this policy is still going on.

During the fighting, the explanation was convincing. The region around the Suez Canal is a strategic key which had at all costs to be kept out of Axis hands. Therefore, although most of the Moslem inhabitants of this area were either hostile to us or neutral, it paid to bribe them by various kinds of subsidies.

While England pulled in its belt and Palestine went short, neutral Egypt was replete with food. Syrian nationalism was encouraged at the cost of alienating a really important ally like France. King Ibn Saud, despot of Saudi Arabia, was given "joint assistance" in the form of food and other supplies.

Now the war is over; the British, who realize how badly they burned their diplomatic fingers by aiding the Arabs to oust the French from Syria and the Lebanon, are suggesting shutting down on subventions to Ibn Saud. They believe this is the only way to compel the monarch to begin modernizing his country and protecting his farmers from his favorite Bedouins.

It is the Americans who are opposed. Our diplomats in the Middle East are hell bent on perpetuating the policy of feeding the Arab potentate's noble desert warriors. To cut down on supplies would, in their eyes, destroy all the good will we have acquired in the past and endanger certain mysterious "American interests."

For they believe that nothing but continuance of the feeding policy can save the king from the armed uprising, probably successful, of the recently conquered Arab sheiks.

Just why should we care about the fate of a medieval-minded despot ruling over a couple of million square miles of desert? What are these mysterious American interests? These are precisely the answers this writer recently set out to find.

It could not be merely that the U. S. A. desires the "friendship" of all people. Even our diplomats know that the friendship of a few million desert nomads is not worth the friendship of any western European people. Yet that is what we jeopardize when we give to Bedouins, neutral in the late war, food that our allies desperately need.

Nor could it be the need for pro-

© 1945, by The New York Post, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tecting the strategic center around the Suez Canal. A king who cannot defend himself against his own rebellious people is certainly not in a position to threaten anyone. Nor could the picturesque Arab potentates and ruling feudal land-owners of the Middle East scare us by threatening to invite the Soviet Union in. They know that they would themselves be the first victims of that country's pitiless anti-fascism. If they forfeit the friendship of the U. S. A. and Britain, they have no one else to turn to.

Finally only one conclusion was left:

What our diplomats call our "real interests" boil down to vast oil concessions given by King Ibn Saud to Standard Oil of California and Standard Oil of Texas. If the king were overthrown, his successors might have other ideas about the rich oil deposits.

The directors of these companies would like the American people to recognize their private holdings as a "real interest" of the United States. They want American taxpayers to keep King Ibn Saud in power. The litany runs—our own oil is rapidly becoming exhausted. American exploitation of foreign oil fields relieves the strain on our deposits and in time of war would be invaluable to the American Navy.

It's a good yarn—but it ain't necessarily so.

In time of peace, Saudi oil can be bought by anyone. There is no saving to us. In time of war, oil is available to any navy which can get to it—to none which cannot regardless of who owns the deposits. It cannot be shown that any Americans but the stockholders in the above companies benefit by American exploitation of Arabian oil.

Protecting King Ibn Saud from possible overthrow by his enemies is therefore not a "real interest of the U. S. A."

Since this is so, further secret appeasement of that gentleman or his Araby friends at the expense of hungry European allies or Jewish victims of Hitler would be an outrageous example of "dollar diplomacy."

• Two rabid Californians, during a heavy rainstorm in Los Angeles, watched the downpour with embarrassed expressions. Finally, after a deep silence, one said to the other: "Boy, some terrible weather certainly blows in from Nevada, doesn't it?"

—*Jobber Topics*

• A Chicago dowager employed a new housekeeper. A few days later she found a letter written by the former housekeeper to her successor, wherein was given a complete account of the house and its hired help. Avidly and shamelessly she read the communication.

The butler, it said, was a pleasant man. The chef was inclined to tipple. The lady's maid gave herself airs . . . and so on.

Huddled away after the signature in a casual postscript, she discovered the damning sentence: "As for the Mr. and Mrs., they behave as well as they know how."

—*The Wall Street Journal*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM: HOW CAN WE I

BY RAISING WAGES

By E. J. Lever

"LABOR demands a 30 per cent wage increase." The press and radio are full of the news, and the public somehow believes there is something wrong and unreasonable about the American worker. But the universality of those demands, emanating from practically all major industries, is a barometer to students of labor problems which indicates something deeper, some economic storm which hit the worker head on and from which he is somehow trying to extricate himself.

Let us look at the worker as he really is, not at some glorified picture of a very prosperous fellow whose war swollen wages have fed his ego for still more. The worker is a fellow who is a wage earner out of necessity, not for the fun of it. He also has a family with the usual dependents to support, and sometimes more.

Assume he is a steelworker. According to a house-to-house study by a competent staff of researchers engaged by the United Steelworkers of America of worker families in the Braddock, Pennsylvania area, a typical steel center, a steelworker, the average head of a family, earned with overtime in January, 1945, a total of $50.85 per week. He paid $4.93 in taxes and therefore had a net spendable income of $45.92. But his weekly expenditures, including payment for war bonds, etc., were $57.01. For his immediate purposes, he therefore went currently in the red by $11.09 weekly. Although the total spendable earnings of 55 per cent of those families exceeded their current expenditures, it was necessary for 45 per cent of the remaining families to spend in excess of their weekly earnings. How then did they get by? By spending their war bonds and similar savings, if any, to the tune of 26 per cent of their original purchases. This, it must be noted, was happening during the war.

With the reduction of the 48-hour war week to one of 40 hours as is now the case (if indeed he still has a job), his weekly income drops from $50.85 to $38.38, a total of $12.47 or 25 per cent. And since living costs increased at least 30 per cent according to government figures (and 45 per cent according to labor studies) his earnings will have dropped in terms of 1941 dollars to $29.52 per week, or $3.33 less than he actually earned in January, 1941. All this represents a reduction of his real wage of 10 per cent, as of four years earlier.

And his savings for a rainy day? Savings of the average Braddock steelworker in January, 1945, was only $333 per family, including war bonds.

(Continued on page 434)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CREASE REAL WAGES?

BY LOWERING PRICES

By Morley G. Dilke

PERHAPS bargaining is a poor name for the process of "collective bargaining". For itself it assumes that both parties come to the market on equal terms and that either party can take or leave the offer of the other. Obviously this has not been the case in the industrial labor market. In general, the preponderance of power has been with the owners of machinery and as a group they have never used that preponderance of power wisely, or justly.

It is probably impossible for them to do so, certainly impossible under any system we have so far devised. The introduction of machinery lead to great abuses in England, first, and afterwards in the United States. This may have been inherent either in human nature, the mercantile system into which the machine was introduced or in the machine itself.

At any rate, machines rapidly increased in number, were obviously desirable to own and equally obviously offered both mechanical and financial advantages in relatively large plants. That is, it early became apparent that an employer of 50 men in the textile industry had an advantage in mechanical efficiency over an employer of five men.

The division of labor, which was greatly increased by the introduction of the machine, was not a new thing in itself. The earliest rural communities, and even pastoral communities, practiced the division of labor to some extent. That is, the American Indians, the bushmen of Australia, had medicine men, and men who made weapons, and in general farming was done by the women. They had no system of land ownership and so had not developed anything that corresponded to rent, mortgages and mortgage interest.

Europe, in which the machine developed, had all of these concepts before the time of the industrial revolution, as well as well-defined inheritance laws, and had pretty well accepted the view-point that certain functions of government were useful to the people and the people should through taxation share in their costs. They also had accepted certain other ideas which they were in the process of discarding while the machine was growing in importance.

The most obvious of these were the divine right of kings and an established state church, the expenses of both church and court being taken out of the annual income in the form of taxes. Even in the middle ages the kings borrowed money and paid interest, and England had a well-defined national debt in the modern sense after the Napoleonic Wars.

(Continued on page 437)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 432)

If he gets out of work, as many are today, his expenses, while somewhat reduced, will nevertheless quickly eat up his meager savings and with it whatever scurity he planned for, including his children's education embracing anything more than public schooling.

INDUSTRY'S ABILITY TO PAY

And what of the steel industry's ability to pay, those two hundred biggest companies employing 475,000 men and women? Out of its net war earnings it paid $765,000,000 in dividends and plowed back another $1,000,000,000 into its reserves. During the last peace years the industry averaged $187,000,000 annually before taxes; during the war years it averaged $700,000,000 a year before taxes, or an increase of 276 per cent. Earnings before taxes in the last pre-war years were $933,000,000; from 1940 to 1944 it was $3,500,000,000. If in spite of this the industry fails to make a net profit in 1946, the government refunds it $149,000,000 under the carry-back provisions of the federal tax laws. Since it made $115,000,000 net after taxes from 1935 to 1939, and $245,000,000 net from 1940 to 1944, the industry increased its net earnings over the previous period by no less than 113 per cent. Can the steel industry pay a living wage?

Or take the textile industry, whose witnesses before a congressional committee recently opposed raising the minimum of the wage-hour law to 65 cents per hour. In April, 1945, the industry employed 607,000 workers, 50 per cent of whom received less than 65 cents per hour, right straight through the war. The industry's profits for 1944 were $871,000,000 before taxes. With the 40-hour week which the industry reverts to after the war, the total increase to 65 cents for all those workers would cost $33,000,000. Thus the industry could pay the 65 cents and still have left for itself $838,000,000 before taxes. Under the circumstances also, the industry could pay a good deal more than the 65 cents minimum demanded by the workers, by the Southern Conference on Human Welfare and other citizens' groups and still have a handsome profit for itself after paying taxes. Should it not make a net profit in 1946, our federal Treasury would refund to it a good many millions of its previously paid taxes. Furthermore, the industry could reduce prices to the consumer at the same time and be even better off, with the increased market resulting for its goods in a clothing hungry world. Profits for cotton textiles alone jumped from $38,000,000 in 1939 to $330,000,000 in 1944. Can the textile industry pay decent wages to the traditionally underpaid textile workers?

Likewise has the public attitude towards war-time strikes been based almost entirely on poor reporting and therefore on some grave misconceptions. The Labor Department's ample figures clearly show that out of the total manhours during the last full war-time years, more than 99 per cent of the available time was devoted by the workers to production. It must also be borne in mind that the no-strike pledge as made to the President was entirely voluntary. Yet American workers are such believers in a self-dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciplined democracy that 99 per cent of them stuck to their jobs, irrespective of thousands of irritants that occur around the workplace and for which there was little remedy in face of the no-strike pledge. Another yardstick is the comparison between loss of time through strikes as against the percentage of men in the armed forces who went A.W.O.L. Obviously a small percentage of Americans in all walks of life and no matter what the circumstances simply refuse to assume their share of responsibility, even in the face of punishment. But a self-assured discipline of 99 per cent represents such an inordinate unanimity as to rekindle the faith of all believers in democracy, and in the worker's determination to preserve it. Hence the American worker has everything to be proud of with respect to his war record and his ability to hold up his end.

Now let us look at the worker's productivity. In face of over 300,000 young steelworkers going into the armed forces, thus throwing the burden on 71 per cent of the workers between 39 and 64 years of age to do the work in this heavy industry; in face of a decreasing standard of living as represented by still rising prices and deterioration in quality of consumer goods; of loss of time due to illness which in 1944 amounted to one week for each member of the family, and of a number of other factors which adversely affect the daily lives of those workers, their productive capacity during the war reached the enormous total of 95,000,000 tons per annum—never before reached in history by this or any other country.

In November, 1944, 9,070,000 workers were engaged in making munitions. During that third war year output was 2.7 times greater than during the first year. That much output would have required 24,000,000 workers at the earlier production rate, or 15,000,000 more men and women than actually did the work. In November, 1942, 1,567,000 workers were fabricating aircraft. Production in 1944 was 1.7 times greater per worker. If continued at the 1942 rate of production, 1,280,000 more workers would have been required to do the same amount of work.

GREAT PRODUCTIVE POTENTIALITIES

Neither is this the whole story. The American people are led to believe that the biggest and most advertised industries are also the most productive. This is not necessarily true, for "gigantism" is a sign of financial control rather than of efficiency. If the facts were known, the total labor costs of an automobile, for instance, would appear so small in relation to its cost to the consumer that inquisitive consumers would surely want to know the reasons for their having to pay so much for a mass produced car. Besides, the productive potentialities of American industry and of its workers have hardly been scratched—even during the war—as evidenced by a number of examples of much greater productivity wherever the workers were given a genuine chance for the fuller participation and planning of the daily activities surrounding their jobs. Given that incentive, of real union-management cooperation, and combined with greater job security for the worker, our productive potentialities are greater than any yet explored by industry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can the oil industry pay higher wages, an industry whose pre-war labor costs were only nine cents per sales dollar? Already an extremely prosperous industry before the war, this industry has been enormously expanded during the war and now also controls synthetic rubber, built with $600,000,000 of the people's money. Among its thousands of products, for instance, is medicinal mineral oil with its pre-war refinery cost of approximately six cents per gallon, but which under various brand names has been marketed for years at from $4 to $8 per gallon, all flowing pretty much out of the same still.

The oil industry, in fact, in its negotiations during the recent strike, offered the workers a 15 per cent increase, with the apparent intention of, for a change, absorbing those costs itself. But students of oil economics are convinced that the oil industry can pay the entire 30 per cent demanded by the workers and still retain its inordinate financial position in the post-war period.

And automotive? One of the independent automotive companies has already agreed without fanfare to raise wages 12½ per cent. Yet the biggest of the Big Three, which together control 90 per cent of the automotive market, spends fortunes on full page advertising in its play for public sympathy, on the grounds that the workers' demands will compel it to increase prices to the consumer on the new models, price rises already allowed by OPA (under congressional pressure, pushed by corporate pressure from behind), *before* the auto workers demanded any increase whatever.

At the same time, some of the biggest steel industrialists privately admit that they, too, can absorb at least a 15 per cent wage increase, although publicly they insist that no increase whatever is possible without government guarantees of a further rise in steel prices.

Can the corporations pay those wage increases? They cannot afford not to, if they are to sell the goods made imperative by an enormously increased productive capacity. But such is their old school economics of scarcity, of restricted production geared to a restricted, high priced market, that they are forced into the old game of working both ends against the middle, of consumer against worker and worker against consumer. Workers have long since learned to understand it, for the usual and coined reply to any of their wage demands for well over a century is that the additional costs if granted must be passed on to the consumer. It is always claimed that the corporation itself never could possibly absorb it. And if workers were foolish enough to believe this hoary old folk tale they never would have won any gains out of their ever increasing productivity. It is the insistence of the workers that they have produced enough for everybody, if fairly shared, that has made possible a much broader distribution to all the people of the fruits of their labor.

POSITION OF CONSUMERS

Our modern conditions of mass production, coupled with the blind old policy of high prices and restricted sales, however, do raise a serious problem. That problem is one of the consumer's position, the consumer of which the worker himself is so large a part. How then convince our business leaders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to lower prices in order to reach all potential consumers, and at the same time raise wages and salaries to make possible such all-out buying by consumers?

The logic of our economic history points to the necessity for a collective bargaining organization—as consumers. In the greatest mass production country in the world, Americans are the only people without a nation-wide organization for their protection as consumers. Through collective bargaining, the worker is bound to win some greater share of his value product. For no matter how badly his case is presented by press and radio, he is still possessed of the undeniable right of refusing to work under conditions onerous to him; and no power on earth less than the guns of dictatorship can force him to work against his will, although that too has been tried in recent years, and failed. With that in mind, the corporation must meet the worker and his union half way at least, whether it likes it or not.

Not so with the consumer. Here the corporations grow unchallenged into an even stronger position to make the consumer pay whatever the traffic will bear, whether wages are an issue or not. This is the real problem faced by the American people today, a problem which the workers themselves are surely beginning to realize. And it will never get nearer a sensible solution until consumers organize on a basis of collective bargaining, to protect their consumer interests, for that is the law of life.

One thing must be credited to the corporations. Unlike during the post World War I period, when the only thing our business men could think of to create prosperity was to cut everyone's wages, this time no one of any consequence even suggests this hoary theory. Thus have our business men finally learned that cutting wages in face of increased productivity simply is no solution whatever.

This may or may not indicate some possibility of their further learning that in an age of mass production, raising wages and salaries and at the same time reducing prices is the kind of sound economics upon which only our modern industrialized economy can survive. If they don't, the American people might as well stop planning now for post-war prosperity, because there is just not going to be any. For only through such means can we achieve sufficient purchasing power which makes possible full employment and genuine prosperity.

(Continued from page 433)

Depreciation was something that all farmers, and most Guild members, knew about, but obsolesence is practically a concept of the machine age. Insurance dates back to burial societies and the early merchant shipping days.

The growth of machinery forced adaptations of all these institutions, and, whatever any of them cost, they are all part of the costs of doing business today.

Certainly today we are not all either employers or employees, in the sense in which the labor-management conference thinks of the term.

William Jennings Bryan made speeches in which he proclaimed: "If tomorrow, every city in the land was destroyed, but the land remained, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the men to work it, we should soon have cities again. But, if the men who work the soil are destroyed by the policies of the cities, soon we will have neither farms nor cities."

A recent editorial in *Labor,* owned by Fifteen Recognized Standard Railroad Organizations, says: "We firmly believe that the interests of the farmers and of the industrial workers are so nearly identical that these two great armies of producers should always stand together and turn deaf ears to those sly propagandists who would like to have the worker believe he is being robbed when the farmer gets good prices, and who would like to persuade the farmer that the worker has a 'soft snap' and fantastically high wages. . . . With the farmer and the industrial worker prosperous, all the other workers of the community will be prosperous. We have made that statement a hundred times in the past, and we expect to continue to make it."

Both statements are probably true, but in the sense that Bryan was using the word, the railroad workers are not producers at all. They, like truck drivers, and the men who write for magazines, or teach school, or man the fire departments, or conduct the courts, may really be part of the industries that have arisen to enable the community to live better rather than to add to its wealth, or even may be part of a wasteful system of distribution which the men who work on the farms and in steel mills have to support, through no fault of their own and in spite of themselves.

Henry George proved to his satisfaction that through the division of labor, there is each year an unearned increment to the wealth of the community. He thought that because land was fixed in amount and could be privately owned, the owners of land had succeeded in getting much more than their share of this unearned increment, and would eventually get it all. He also thought that there was a real connection between this inequitable distribution of the annual income and the fact that pioneering communities although less rich as a whole had no such wide divergences of income as more settled ones.

DISTRIBUTION OF UNEARNED INCREMENT

As machines developed, this unearned increment has grown, but a greater percentage of it has gone to the owners of machinery than to the owners of land. The income tax has been designed to do part of the job for the community that Henry George hoped to accomplish with the Single Tax.

We are in the midst of a period when we have tried to manipulate the economic system so that, in spite of war, it would establish a cross between the status quo and a more satisfactory distribution of wealth. This has been partially successful for some of the community. Industrial workers and farmers have been more prosperous and the community as a whole has been prosperous. However, we are still operating on a price system. The community as a whole, the government, has been the principal customer of industry. It has bought at high prices, so high that many industries have had excess profits which the community has redeemed in the form of excess profits taxes. It has only paid in part for all of its purchases. The balance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of its debts, almost 50 per cent in fact, has been paid for by issuing bonds. The bonds bear interest and the interest and principal must eventually be paid. The goods the country has bought have been, for the most part, consumption goods, a large share munitions, and lend-lease balances plus the sale of surplus inventories will of course not be equal to the increased national debt.

There is an old New England saying that "nothing is sure but death and taxes." From the view-point of the employers interest, depreciation and amortization are about as important. So is the ability to be able to pay for all the goods and services performed for the business prior to the time the materials are purchased.

In other words, everyone who works at a machine has to add enough value to the materials he is given to work with to pay for the materials, pay all the overhead costs of the business he works for including taxes, and to make his own pay.

In the same paper *Labor,* from which we quoted above, there is an article by the president of one of the unions which publishes the paper in which he says that the St. Lawrence waterway project would be bad for the nation. The same issue quoted from a similar speech from the view-point of railroad management and interests.

I am only quoting *Labor* because it is an intelligent newspaper devoted primarily to the interests of the railroad workers. Their interests are not always exactly the same as the interests of all other industrial employees or as those of the farmers. New York state for many years has been convinced that the St. Lawrence waterways project would benefit the nation as a whole. Without knowing whether the railways or the state are right or wrong in the matter, it is at least clear that the railroad groups think that the St. Lawrence waterways would injure them.

WAGES AND HOURS LEGISLATION

This conflict of interests basically has been the difficulty throughout the period of the war. At the depth of the depression when the wages and hours law first went into effect, the minimum wage was 25 cents per hour and the maximum wage that could be set by any industry was 40 cents per hour. This simply means that no industry could, by law, be compelled to pay its lowest paid employee more than that amount.

There is always a relationship between wages and prices, and there is always a relationship between the wages of skilled workers and of laborers. It is interesting to note that the Office of Stabilization Administration on December 6 announced that the percentage increase in the cost of living between January, 1941 and September, 1945, "Shall be deemed to be 33 per cent." On October 24, 1938, the Wages and Hours law setting a minimum of 25 cents per hour went into effect. By its terms, at the end of seven years the minimum was to be 40 cents per hour. For all practical purposes the 40 cent minimum was a minor consideration in 1945. Now the C.I.O. considers wages of less than 87½ cents per hour sub-standard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Last year the research department of the Textile Workers Union, C.I.O., made an elaborate investigation in five textile communities, of current retail prices of food, clothing and other items in the Emergency Budget. This investigation, conducted with the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, has been generally accepted by economists and social workers as thorough and accurate. It found that to maintain the average American *family of four*, on this budget today, an income of $1752 a year is needed. In non-war times a worker who gets 2000 hours of employment is lucky; that would be 50 40-hour weeks. A simple calculation shows that to make $1752 in 2000 hours, the worker must be paid at the rate of 87½ cents an hour." (From Sub-standard Wages, prepared in cooperation with T.W.U. of A., C.I.O., Department of Research and Education, C.I.O.)

A bill has been proposed by Senator Claude Pepper, supported by a group of perhaps a dozen senators, to increase the minimum now at 40 cents to 65 cents per hour for the first year after passage of the bill, 70 cents for the second year and 75 cents thereafter. President Truman has characterized the 40 cent minimum as obsolete.

Labor has primarily been interested in increasing money wages on the assumption that real wages will automatically be increased. It is certainly true that the standard of living for all employed people has improved through the years. But it may well be that it has improved because of the increased use of machinery and in spite of the wage policies of employers, employees and government.

New and more productive machinery is always met by the opposition of the owners of the machinery it will replace and by the men who have spent considerable time learning how to operate the obsolete machines. This, plus over-capitalization, I think, is the history of the railroad business and explains why stockholders, management and employees who benefit from "feather-bedding" can unite against the St. Lawrence waterways. It also explains why the trucking industry eventually came under the domination of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This body has accepted the premise that the public needs the railroads and fears as much as the railroads themselves the competition of the trucks. If air freight becomes a serious competitor, the railroad industry and the trucking industry will eventually want to force the aviation industry, too, to prices which will permit them to compete with the air-lines.

To restrict production so that you can get a higher price for your goods, and, if you have to, pay more for your labor in the process, are obvious, but not necessarily true. Everyone sees it sooner or later and wherever machines have come into use it is doubly observed.

Both the cartels of employers, organized to guarantee a fair return against chiselers, and the trade union theory of spreading the work by restricting production and the number of apprentices sprang up in England and have come to be accepted in the United States. Of course, while England restricted her production America took many of her markets away from her.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now America may well be embarking on a process that will eventually lose her her world markets as she has lost the cotton market.

The mere fact that we have had to resort to lend-lease indicates that our prices in relation to the prices of the rest of the world are out of line. The Commodity Credit Corporation recently approved an export bonus on cotton of four cents a pound. Brazil cut her export price four cents and protested the use by us of an export bounty as a flagrant violation of our commitments. As a matter of fact, the other cotton producers can probably still under-cut us in the foreign market, even with the export bonus.

If it is true that wages in, say, Arkansas should bear some relation to wages in Detroit, it must also be true that wages in China and India are out of line with wages in America. If this is true in both cases, the problem of American labor is not to evolve a method of increasing wages which will also automatically move up prices in direct proportion, but rather to find a method of reducing prices without reducing real wages—that is, without reducing the quantity of goods that a week's wages will buy. If manpower aided by machines will produce more goods than manpower without machines, why have prices been increasing steadily in the United States? The answer to this may, in the long run, go back to such charges as taxes, interest, depreciation, amortization and insurance as well as the accounting concept that the running time of a machine must pay for the estimated idle time and the labor concept that, if you work in an industry affected by the weather, or by seasonal lay-offs, you should be paid for your idle time. All this is comparable to mortgage interest or the taxes on an empty building. I am not advocating the discontinuance of any or all of these charges, but suggesting that labor, if it is willing to be paid for work it does, should see to it that machinery too is paid for the work it does instead of being willing to see machinery paid for work that it does not do provided labor also is paid for restricted production.

When management is in the saddle its policy is to increase prices, and it permits wages to go up if it must. This resulted in the 1929 depression and politically labor was eventually in the saddle. Its policy was to increase wages and let prices go up if it must. This policy has been altered by the war, when prices were, in large part, prices to the government, and the goods purchased were paid for by increasing the national debt.

The combined wage and price policies of not 10 years but 60 have made such export subsidies as lend-lease necessary for us to be able to do business abroad. Government, labor and industry all agree that we must have some foreign trade to be prosperous, and I suggest that the fact-finding bodies proposed by President Truman should first attack the problem of reducing prices without reducing real wages, as the only practicable method of keeping our machinery going the 50 weeks of 40 hours that the C.I.O. sets as its goal. Real fact finding will undoubtedly show some industries and some trades are overpaid in relation to others, and that may be the reason that neither employers nor workers are anxious to rest their case on the facts they can present to prove it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe wants reform within freedom

Austrian Elections

By Barnet Nover

From his column in The Washington Post

"THE world public," said a recent Soviet broadcast, "is paying great attention to the elections in Austria.

"They expect from Austria a clear and vigorous break with the past, a clear expression of Austria's determination to eliminate the last remnants of Nazism, and a decisive step forward toward the consolidation of democracy.

"The more unambiguously the Austrian people make this avowal, the more speedily will they gain the confidence of the freedom-loving nations."

These elections have now been held.

To Russia's credit it must be said that nowhere in the Russian zone was the slightest attempt made by the occupation authorities to interfere with or influence the balloting. The same was equally true in the other zones. In fact, what happened in Austria was completely in line with the stipulations agreed on at Yalta concerning the holding in liberated lands of "free and unfettered elections . . . on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."

The results speak for themselves. They show that political trends in Austria are broadly speaking parallel to those previously revealed in every other country in Europe where, during recent months, free elections have been held, namely, in Great Britain, France, Norway, Denmark and Hungary.

Despite the prestige derived by Russia from having played the dominant part in the liberation of Austria, despite the fact that it was Russia which took the lead in setting up the Renner regime and, later, in extending recognition to it, the Austrians overwhelmingly rejected communism. That was as true in the industrial centers as in rural areas, in the Russian zone no less than in the other zones.

The victors in the elections were the two parties that represent not a "vigorous break with the past," but a continuation of political ideologies that dominated Austria from the foundation of the republic in 1918 to the Anschluss of 1938.

These two parties are the Socialists and the Austrian People's party, the new name for the Christian Social party of pre-Anschluss days. In its philosophy, the People's party represents today the Austrian counterpart of the French MRP and like it is liberal and Catholic.

It is an extraordinarily significant phenomenon that in a Europe which is cold, hungry, roofless and disillusioned—a Europe in other words which outwardly should be ripe for communism—communism is making very little headway.

© 1945, by The Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lobby techniques accepted by Congress

Pressure Parodies Democracy

By Marquis Childs

From his column in The Washington Post

WHEN Chester Bowles complained about the tactics of Washington pressure lobbies, he knew what he was talking about. Bowles and his O.P.A. have been under fire from every direction, surrounded by enemies howling for higher prices and fewer restrictions.

The idea of government by pressure, as Bowles pointed out, assumes that officials should base their decisions not on the merits of an issue, but on the degree of pressure which can be focused on a given point. It's the principle of the steam boiler. If a lobby can generate enough heat to force the needle in the gauge up to the proper notch, then action must automatically follow.

What is more, Congress seems to accept this technique. At least, there have been no outcries against the practice, and the staffs in congressional offices spend considerable time counting letters and telegrams.

The time was when Congress felt very touchy about pressure tactics as applied to important decisions. Just a decade ago—and what a different decade it was—the Senate passed without opposition a bill to register and regulate Washington lobbyists.

It defined a lobbyist as "any person who shall engage himself for pay, or for any consideration, to attempt to influence legislation, or to prevent legislation, by Congress, or to influence any Federal bureau, agency, or Government official, or Government employe, to make, modify, alter, or cancel any contract with the United States Government, or any United States bureau, agency, or official, as such official, or to influence any such bureau, agency or official in the administration of any Government duty, so as to give any benefit or advantage to any private corporation or individual."

That's a sweeping definition. It would take in today a considerable section of Washington's population.

The bill, which never got beyond the Senate, did not prohibit the activities of lobbyists. But it required them to register with the House and Senate, to state how much they were paid, what they allowed for expenses and what was included under the head of expenses. This last would cover much of the expensive entertaining done in cocktail lounges and private dining rooms.

The author of that bill of a decade ago was a young Senator out of Alabama, named Hugo Black. With a deep feeling for those whose voice is rarely heard in the halls of government—for the millions who live on the wrong side of the tracks—Black had conducted a hard-hitting investigation showing the technique

© 1945, by The Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the pressure lobbies which then infested Washington in much smaller numbers than they do today.

The skillfully directed investigation had shown in case after case how a deluge of telegrams and letters could be arranged to intimidate Congressmen on a given issue. Sometimes, as the inquiry revealed, those whose names were signed to the telegrams did not even know that their names had been so used. Lists of names were provided; the lobby directed the sending of the wires and paid the bill.

Such an investigation would serve a healthy purpose. Black, in his Senate career, stepped on a great many sensitive toes, but often got action. In the cloistered atmosphere of the Supreme Court he must sometimes long for that other era.

Government by pressure is not democracy. It is a parody of democracy, and it is time that it was shown again in its true light.

The Woman's Touch

By H. C. L. Jackson

From his column "Listening in on Detroit" in The Detroit News

THE engineer, feeling festive perhaps, whammed his engine into the passenger train so enthusiastically that several overseas veterans in one car were jounced around, and one elderly civilian fell on the floor.

Whereupon a Major—medical—with a double row of service ribbons, got up and stepped over to estimate the damage. But—

Even before he helped the civilian to his feet, a small and succinct whirlwind descended on him in the form of a wiry old lady with eyes as bright as buttons snapping behind a pair of steel spectacles.

"Boy," she flashed at the Major, "you leave that poor man alone. I'll take care of him. I've had First Aid. You run to the diner and get some sterile water. Hurry."

While many a veteran sagged his jaw, the Major scurried away.

He was back, almost before the little old lady had the elderly civilian protestingly propped back in his seat.

"It took you long enough," she told the Major, and dabbed water from the pitcher with a handkerchief to the minor cut.

"Now," said she, "a bandage. Boy," again at the Major, "you run out in the vestibule. I saw a First Aid kit there."

"Er," mumbled the Major, "wouldn't this, er, band-aid do?" He brought one from his pocket.

"Yes," said the lady, slapped it in place, said to the Major, "Take that water pitcher back to the diner," and proceeded down the

© 1945, by the Detroit News, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aisle to her seat, where she planted herself with prim self-approval.

When the Major came back, he had to pass her on his way to his seat. She looked up at him and said, most distinctly:

"Remember what you've learned, young man."

"Yes'm," responded the Major, and sat down and proceeded to let the red recede from his ears . . .

Maybe women will understand this story, and maybe a few men will. Anyway:

He sat on the two-person seat behind the driver on the well-filled bus—a lieutenant—and the white bandage under his officer's cap had that useful article tipped at quite the rakish angle.

At the next stop, a girl got on, and the lieutenant bounced to his feet as if he'd heard an order.

But the girl looked at the bandage and at the back of the bus and, smiling, said: "Thank you, but there's one seat left back there." And to it she walked.

Two blocks later a middle-aged woman got on.

Again the lieutenant was on his feet, but at the same moment a civilian, two seats away, came up from behind his newspaper. He looked like an earnest person who has read a great deal about how to treat the returning veteran.

Completely overlooking the woman who thus had a choice between two seats, the civilian said to the lieutenant:

"You sit down here, son."

"No, thank you, sir," from the lieutenant, "I'd rather stand."

"Go ahead," snapped the civilian. "Sit down!"

"Thank you, sir," smiled the lieutenant, "but——"

While this was going on the woman, her eyes glinting rather angrily, plumped herself in the lieutenant's seat. Then she said to the civilian in quite a sharp voice:

"Sit down again, mister, and let the lieutenant stand. And while he's standing he can think this over: When you're doing something for a woman, treat her as a person, not as a principle."

• A young man, called for military service, presented his draft board with the following excuse: "Convalescing from traumatic perrosynovitis of the flexor digitorum sublimus in profundus muscle at the metacarpo-phalangeal joint."

The army said no, a sore finger wasn't a good enough excuse.

—Counterpoints

• At two o'clock in the morning a lady telephoned the president of a large department store. After much ringing, the mogul answered with a sleepy and gruff "Hello!"

"This is Mrs. So-and-So," said the lady, in a sirupy voice. "I just couldn't help calling you personally to tell you that the hat I bought at your store last week is simply stunning."

"That's all very nice," yawned the president, "but would you mind telling me, madam, why you called me up at this hour about a hat you bought last week?"

"Because," she replied politely, "your truck just delivered it."

—Carpaco Bugle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Rights of Man" flourish in Saigon

As France Sowed . . .

By Louis Clair

From his column in The Progressive

LEST the wave of unrest which swept over Indo-China spread to Burma and Malaya, British and some American troops fought popular uprisings in Indo-China to reinstall French administration. It is to make Indo-China safe for the French that Japanese troops were used by Allied commanders. What is the record of France in Indo-China?

"They were beaten into unconsciousness, all modern torture measures were employed: beating of the plants of the feet, electrical instruments applied to the sexual organs, breaking of limbs, etc."

Berlin 1940? No, Indo-China 1930! These were the means employed by the French against the Indo-Chinese national movement.

Indo-China has a population of 22 million natives who are ruled by 45,000 Europeans. Since they occupied Indo-China toward the end of the last century, the French have succeeded in breaking up an old culture and have replaced the former Indo-Chinese elite by a servile clique of native quislings. True, they have built good roads so that French goods can easily penetrate into the country and Indo-Chinese raw materials can be taken out—and every time Indo-China is mentioned, they point to these roads with pride, as Mussolini pointed to the Italian trains running on time.

Indo-China has an illiteracy rate of 89 per cent. Of the 2,000,000 children of school age, only about 315,000 get any schooling at all in private or government schools. There is not a single university. Indo-Chinese students have to study in France where they learn about liberty, equality and fraternity, but when they return home they soon discover that their new ideas are subversive, that they are definitely not for import. It is from their ranks that sprang most of the leaders of Indo-Chinese nationalism.

In 1924, a new penal code was promulgated, according to which "every injurious criticism of the acts of the French administration . . . is punished with imprisonment from 3 months to 3 years . . ." Freedom of association never existed; all assembly of more than 20 persons was strictly forbidden; no legal party allowed; the press rigidly controlled; not a word being printed which had not first been passed by the censor. When, some years ago, a young Indo-Chinese wrote the words "Annamese Republic first year" in Chinese characters in the corner of an official poster, he was sentenced to nine years of hard labor.

After the 1930 wave of unrest, nationalists were thrown into unsanitary prisons by the thousands, where they died like flies. In one of these

© 1945, by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jails, 200 out of 500 prisoners died within 18 months.

There was no unified administration. As John Gunther once remarked: "The French are great partitionists. Their method of administration is to divide and subdivide." Thus, some parts of Indo-China were direct French colonies, others were governed by the puppet "Emperor" of Annam; there was even one part that was theoretically represented in the French parliament by a regular deputy—but this deputy was elected by an electoral college of a few thousand, mostly Europeans and a few quislings, since only a handful of natives have ever been granted French citizenship.

In fact, the whole country was autocratically governed by a Governor-General appointed from Paris, sole intermediary between the French government and the colony. His powers were more absolute than those of any king.

Indo-China is rich in natural wealth. All this wealth is controlled by a handful of huge French companies. The country was fast becoming one of the great rubber exporters of the world: exports in 1939 amounted to 68,900 tons, nearly all of it going to France. Indo-China exported 1,821,400 tons of anthracite coal, most of this mined by one single company, which in a couple of years nearly tripled its working capital.

Indo-China is one of the greatest rice exporters of the world (1,672,900 tons in 1939). Total exports in 1939 were valued at more than $86,000,000—most of it going to France and almost all of it handled by French firms.

The Indo-Chinese coal miners extract coal at three to four francs for a 10-hour day—French coal miners got more than 10 times as much for a 40-hour week. No wonder that French capitalists urgently request that they again be allowed to take up their "civilizatory mission." In 1939, the average wage of natives for unskilled work was 20 cents a day. Naturally, unions are outlawed.

While the sale of opium is strictly forbidden in France because this "undermines the health and the vitality of the population," there are no such restrictions in Indo-China, where in fact opium was smoked and sold quite freely. The "health and vitality" of the Indo-Chinese was apparently less important to the French—after all, there are 20 million of them.

The taxes imposed on the wretched natives are exorbitant. The average peasant or worker must give one to two months of his miserable salary to the tax collector. He has to pay in cash and since in most cases the peasants produce very little for the market, they have to sell all their belongings in times of famine in order to meet the demands of the tax collector.

The French now claim that the native nationalist movement which opposes their return, the *Viet Nam,* is inspired by German and Japanese agents. The press has printed ludicrous stories from French sources about German espionage specialists who allegedly organized the *Viet Nam.* But those really responsible for the movement are the French themselves—the chickens have come home to roost.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French regime of Indo-China was the most oppressive of all Far Eastern regimes. A distinguished French journalist, Andre Viollis, who visited Indo-China just after having published a book violently attacking the British regime in India, had to admit regretfully that conditions in Indo-China were incomparably worse.

The Vichy French, under Admiral Decoux as Governor-General, for years collaborated in trade with the Japanese. The French colonial administration considered that nothing could be worse than a loosening of its grip on the natives, and thus made all sorts of deals with the Japanese. Indo-Chinese native leaders who had attempted to organize resistance against the Japanese since the early days of the war were oppressed by the French.

The Japanese, rather satisfied with this arrangement, seized certain military installations and moved troops into Indo-China, but still maintained the French administration. Only on March 9 of 1945, after their Burma defeat, did the Japanese proclaim the independence of most of Indo-China, thus clearly intending to plant a time bomb which would explode after their defeat.

During the days of March, the French only offered a rather perfunctory resistance. Three thousand men escaped to China, the rest were either killed or interned. This is why there was no French army in China at the moment of Japan's defeat, and the French, therefore, asked the British and Chinese for help in the re-conquest of their empire. The Chinese were to occupy the north and the British the south. It is only now that French troops are beginning to arrive.

When the Japanese army collapsed, Indo-Chinese nationalists set up a new administration based on the nationalist Annamite party, *Viet Nam,* whose sympathies are anti-French and pro-Chinese. This nationalist government is installed in Hanoi, in the north of the country, and is now cooperating with the Chinese occupation authorities.

In the south, the British attempted to put the French back into power immediately. But, as a *New York Times* editorial recently pointed out, "the slogans of freedom used during the war have naturally had an effect upon subject populations in the Orient." The "subject populations" of Asia are not ready to accept weakly again their European overlords. And thus, large-scale riots broke out in Saigon, capital of southern Indo-China.

These riots were apparently a leaderless affair. The Annamites waged a disorganized campaign, shooting from rooftops and other places of concealment. The streets of Hanoi are decorated with signs reading: "Down with French imperialism," "Death to French domination," "Welcome Allies," and "Long Live the United Nations Commission."

A spokesman for the nationalists, Prof. Tran Duc Thac, vice-president of the Indo-Chinese General Delegation, stated in an interview in Paris: "Only France menaces the independence of Indo-China. Our object is to let the French people know what the effect of the arrival of the forces of Gen. Leclerc is go-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to be. We will resist the French." "*Viet Nam,* the Indo-Chinese resistance movement," he said, "demanded total withdrawal of French troops and officials. Later a treaty might be made permitting French technicians, industrialists, and others to work in Indo-China on the same basis as other foreigners. We don't fear the Chinese or the British," explained the professor, "because they intended to withdraw —but the French intend to stay."

The French administration has announced a number of reforms for the time when it will again be safely installed in Indo-China. It now makes solemn promises to mend the errors of its ways—once back. But the Indo-Chinese are weary of these promises. They have heard too many of them already. They know very well that once the French are solidly entrenched again, there is no hope for really basic reforms. In North Africa too the French had promised all the benefits of democracy, but so far nothing basic has changed, and in the recent food riots which the French misnamed "an uprising," uncounted thousands of Arabs were mowed down by American Lend-Lease planes in the service of the French colonial administration. Indeed, the Indo-Chinese have all reasons to be weary of French promises.

The following revealing appeal from Hanoi has been completely suppressed here:

Hanoi telegraph service, Sept. 27, "to Prime Minister Attlee from the Foreign Minister of the *Viet Nam* Republic":

"The release of French prisoners of war with arms and ammunition, which led to the French attack against Saigon, and the arrests of members of the People's Committee constitute a grave violation of our national dignity, as well as the non-fulfilment of the mission entrusted to the Commander of the British forces in South Indo-China by the United Nations, a failure to abide by the Atlantic Charter, and an unneutral attitude on the part of the British disarmament forces.

"We therefore lodge a most emphatic protest against such smoke-screening of French aggression, and express the earnest hope that you will intervene on the basis of full respect for the independence of the *Viet Nam* Republic."

That Japanese troops under the command of their regular officers were employed to put down the Saigon revolt is a fitting climax. Allied troops drafted in this war for freedom now serve to impose the white man's domination over the millions of colonial Asiatic people—and the Japanese came in handy as auxiliary police troops to implement this worthy endeavor. Small wonder that we evoke only a cynical smile from the peoples of Asia when we mention democracy or the Atlantic Charter. After Hiroshima—Saigon.

Paul Giaccobi, French minister of colonies, in a recent statement blamed France's troubles in Indo-China on foreign support of the nationalist movements. Unfortunately, he is wrong. But it would indeed be the duty of all those who believe that the rights of man are not for domestic consumption only to make their voices heard in support of a people that has bravely taken up the fight for its independence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Should We Do in China?

American foreign policy is caught in the crossfire of the civil war in China.

AMERICA'S POLICY IN CHINA

Ambassador Hurley's theatrical resignation at least has had the merit of giving us a chance to clear the air in China and pull out of a situation that finds us in the midst of a civil war in which we have everything to lose and nothing to gain.

Former Ambassador Hurley, in defending his activities in China, has referred to the position taken by Cordell Hull back in 1941:

"On November 26, 1941, Secretary of State Hull asked Japan to agree that 'the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking'."

He has insisted, too, that F.D.R. gave him a clear-cut directive that gave as its primary aim the keeping of Chiang Kai-shek in the war against Japan, and secondarily to "unify the anti-Japanese military forces in China, to prevent civil war in China and to support the aspirations of the Chinese people to establish for themselves a free, united, democratic government."

Nobody can quarrel with those objectives. It is entirely to our advantage and that of the Chinese to have a unified China. But what is intolerable is to have these objectives squeezed into so narrow a strait jacket that they end up as justification for a course that has put us squarely in the midst of a Chinese civil war, where we have thousands of troops committed to the services of the Central government against the Chinese Communists and where, if anything, we are setting back the chances of a truly democratic government in China for long years.

Hurley has insisted that his course was in full accord with the Roosevelt and Hull policies. This is exactly what is not so. The purposes of F.D.R., and of Truman after him, have been to compose the differences between the Central government and the Communists. The whole course of Hurley's activities, despite his superficial "unity" efforts, has been to exacerbate them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by encouraging Chiang to count on full support from us, to solve his internal problems with our armed aid.

The weakness of the Hurley policy has been clearly illustrated by the excuse that our men are now in China to see that the Japanese there get home safely in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration. If it had been the original purpose of the Hurley policy, then what would have prevented our taking the surrendered Japanese from the hands of the Communists, something that we refused to do?

General Marshall has one sweet job on his hands, as a result of the Hurley failure:

He has got to get our troops out of China just as fast as he can, and that is an operation, which, at this late date, is going to call for all of his military ability. The American people are NOT going to fight a civil war for Chiang Kai-shek, no matter how desperately anxious Hurley is for us to remain in China until conditions are "stable" there.

—PM

LET'S NOT ABANDON CHINA AS WE ABANDONED SPAIN

The wheel of history has made a half-circle.

We are now confronted in China with the situation we faced in Spain during its Civil War—in reverse.

In Spain in 1936-1939, it was the Communists and left-wingers who insisted that we should intervene on the side of Spain's legitimate government.

The U. S. and the other democracies refused, clung to a hypocritical non-intervention policy that left Spain's democratic government at the mercy of the rebels. The Communists openly helped the Spanish government, getting much gold and more credit for their little aid—and further alienating democratic opinion.

Our failure to support Spain's legitimate government meant that Franco won and democracy lost, and that we forfeited a potential ally as Spain became a Nazi-fascist puppet.

Now it's the Communists and other left-wingers who rage against American support of China's legitimate government headed by Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang's government is recognized by all the major powers, including Russia.

The American Communists would have us desert Chiang and abandon China to a civil war between Chiang and the Chinese Communists, recognized by no major power.

We should not make the same mistake twice. We should continue our support of China's legitimate government headed by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man who is our friend, who fought the Japanese four years before Pearl Harbor and fought on while we were still selling scrap iron to Japan.

Withdrawal of our support now would mean full-scale civil war in China. Continued support to Chiang may help China on her difficult road toward democracy. We don't want an Asiatic Spain as the prelude to another world war.

—*Philadelphia Record*

OUR CHINESE CIVIL WAR?

As the Chungking government and the Yenan government of the Chinese communists raced to take over territory from the beaten Japanese, United States Marines stepped in and took Peiping and Chinwangtao, Tientsin and Tsingtao, to hand them over to Chungking. United States airmen flew Chiang Kai-shek's armies to Peiping and Shanghai and Nanking. United States naval forces cruised offshore from Chefoo, the Chinese Communists' only port, a tacit threat to their occupancy. United States vessels, by report, loaded Chungking troops at Haiphont and Kowloon, to transport them to Manchuria, where the Chinese Communists are installed.

These activities mean only one thing: the United States is fighting an undeclared war with the Yenan government. It is a shocking fact. Many of us may not be ready to admit it. But the Yenan government cannot ignore it.

It is understandable that the Chinese Communists are bitter, for while we have not declared war on them, we are in military alliance with the Nationalist Government of China against them. How long can we stay short of actual shooting if we persist in this folly of military meddling with China's civil affairs?

General Mao Tze-tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist party, could hardly have spoken more bitterly than he did when he said that "the ruling cliques of the Kuomintang . . . hope that certain Allied officers will fill the same role in China as General Scobie did in Greece."

Is the United States to pursue in China the ugly and indefensible tactics which the British pursued in Greece? For lack of a definite foreign policy, our nation has followed a policy of drift there. Is it not time for a positive statement of our policy in China?

An Associated Press report from Hankow says the question on the lips of virtually every man among the American air force personnel moving Chungking troops up against the Chinese Communists is: "What are we doing meddling in the internal affairs of China?

That is what we would all like to know.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SQUARING OFF IN CHINA

It looks as if, in aiding the Chungking government to take the surrender of Japanese forces in China, we have got caught in the crossfire of civil conflict in China.

It had been hoped that by this time the Chungking government and the Communists would have composed their differences. But a basic issue remains, which is aggravated by our aid in escorting and transporting troops into areas to which the Communists lay claim. They want the right to name governors in northern provinces so as to insure a base of power. This, of course, is not the way to promote unity in China, but the Communists intend to take no chances, and they find a good deal of justification for their suspicions of Chungking in the fate that attended Yunan's governor, Lung Yun, when he was dispatched to Indo-China to help take the Japanese surrender there. Chungking took over his province, and at last report Lung Yun had become a virtual prisoner of the Chungking authorities.

Among the uneasy signs justifying Communist concern over the American position is the recruiting that is now going on in America by the Chungking government. A post-war United States military mission of 2000 officers is being enlisted. Demobilized airmen in an unstated number are being hired by Chungking officials for high pay. General Chennault is said to be on the verge of leaving for China, General Wedemeyer to be about to return as Chiang Kai-shek's chief of staff. In these actions there is nothing formally prejudicial, since we are committed under the surrender arrangements to aid Chungking, and there is nothing in our laws, moreover, to forbid the private employment of Americans as mercenaries. At the same time, if the War Department is lending its support or even its countenance to China's recruitment campaign in this country, it is committing this country, in our opinion, to a path of folly. The anxiety with which Chungking wants to build up a military establishment at a time when it is talking peace with the Communists has ominous implications.

Our position in China is complicated by Russia's attitude. Help to Chungking is specifically pledged under the Russo-Chinese accord of August 14. In the clause "Agreement on Government," the Soviet government declared that it was "ready to render China moral support and assistance with military equipment and other military resources, this support and assistance [to be] given fully to the national government as the central government of China." Words have no meaning if the intent were not to disavow the Communists in favor of Chungking. Yet, since this agreement was signed, the Russians have let the Communists

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into Manchuria, which they had transferred to Chungking; they have armed them on Manchuria's borders; they have fraternized with them. A reminder of Russia's obligations is in order not merely to call Moscow to account but also to re-establish the joint Russo-American policy in China which should be the condition precedent of our relations to China. What we do in China is not as important as that we do it together.

—*The Washington Post*

CHINESE POWDER KEG

Unidentified "high diplomatic quarters" are quoted in a current Washington dispatch as believing that the Chinese civil war would soon end if the United States and Russia jointly announced a "hands-off" policy and stayed by it.

These observers point out that most of China's civil wars in the past have been fought because one side or the other thought it could count upon support by a major power.

These careful gentlemen "do not imply" that the United States is interfering in China in behalf of the Chiang government. Well, we do. We consider invalid and disingenuous the War Department's official explanation that American transports carried Chiang troops to Northern China and Manchuria to disarm the Japanese. This assistance also delivered Chiang troops to places where we knew they were going to fight other Chinese. Had we wished to remain entirely neutral in the matter, our own troops could have disarmed the Japanese and then scrapped the arms.

Not the least disquieting aspects of the China situation comes now to light in the State Department's announcement, through Secretary Byrnes, that the State Department was not consulted on the use of Marines in North China, or the use of United States warships to carry Chiang troops there. This, again, sounds disingenuous. In view of long and intensive State Department liaison with Chungking, culminating in the Hurley mission, we hope Byrnes is not asking us to suppose that post-armistice transportation of Chiang troops never came up in prospect. Perhaps Mr. Byrnes means that the State Department was not officially consulted as to the specific movements in question. Either way, it is not good enough. The American people has not delegated policy-making to the War Department, nor the right to make military decisions clearly involving high policy. This places the State Department either in the position of abetting a new and objectionable investiture or of not having known what was happening in the field where it has been so busy for so long and in its own sphere of responsibility.

—*San Francisco Chronicle*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An inventory of our utility dollar

"A Brief Message . . ."

By Miles McMillin

From his column in The Progressive

IT was Sunday afternoon, and the radio was on. Somebody announced that Nelson Eddy was going to sing, and before I could get up and turn it off, a "brief message from our sponsor" gave me pause. "Our sponsor" was the power companies of America.

The announcer who read it began very dramatically—just as the radio script writer learned from rule 37 in the book of "How to Catch and Hold The Interest of The Boobs Who Listen to The Plug Uglies."

He said, "I am going to tear up my utility bill." Mr. Eddy, in his oatmeal-filled-mouth way, protested emphatically, warning him that he oughta not do it. Well, it turned out that the rider of the plug-ugly was only kidding and that he meant he was going to dissect it and let all us listeners know how our utility dollar was being spent.

The dissection proceeded generally along these lines: This big chunk here goes for wages; this teensy-weensy one for profits; and finally this great enormous slice goes into taxes which were exclusively responsible for re-raising Old Glory over Corregidor and which bought the bombs that wrecked Hitler's chalet at Berchtesgaden.

I waited patiently for some explanation of what part of my utility dollar pays Mr. Eddy's salary and the salaries of the other guest artists, orchestra, announcers and all the other people who go to make up one of these big national network radio programs. But none was forthcoming.

Now I happen to know that the costs of this program and the full page ads which the private utilities are cramming into every publication they see or hear about are paid for by me. It is a legitimate expense which is usually called "advertising" or "cost of operation" and figured in on the rate base and passed along to the consumer.

Naturally I was vexed at this failure to give a full report on how my dollar is being spent. It betrays an attitude not at all like the ads I have been reading in which it is plainly stated that the utilities have no desire other than to serve me with utmost efficiency, complete candor, noble humility, and in wretched poverty.

My first reaction was to sit down and write a sharp note on the back of my next utility bill to the local manager of the Wall Street owned utility telling him that I was withholding payment until I had a complete report on just how much I am paying Nelson Eddy and that man of evasion who failed to give me the report that was my due.

© 1945, by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I kept my peace, turned the radio off and sat down to brood about my utility dollar, and how it was being used. It would seem that the Wall Street people who decide how my dollar should be spent will stop at nothing. Not only do I contribute to Nelson Eddy and the man who tells me how lucky I am to have that privilege under "business managed utilities," but there are various other ways in which I am privileged to contribute.

One of these is mentioned above —the big advertising spreads in national publications. Another—and one of the most interesting right now—is the big powerful lobby we have established in Washington to see to it that no more of those communistic experiments like the Tennessee Valley Authority get underway in this country. Of course, I don't know what my exact contribution to this lobby is either, but I do know that it is one of the biggest and champagne-buyingest gangs we've ever had down there since the days of old Sam Insull and the National Electric Light Association.

And are we getting results! We've got Congress backed right down in the storm cellar our boys have been living in for the past decade. Especially on the Missouri Valley Authority proposal. Two committees, the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and the Senate Commerce Committee, have kicked it out with a loud and emphatic no. It will soon go to the Senate Agriculture Committee where, chances are, it won't even be given a hearing.

We aren't going bad with President Truman either. He sort of gave us the double cross by coming out for the St. Lawrence Seaway head on the way he did, but then that was to be expected . After all, some of our own boys are letting us down on the St. Lawrence business, including the titular head of the Republican party, Tom Dewey. And don't forget Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan. It's getting so you can't even depend on the Republicans anymore.

But the President did do us a good turn when he spoke at the dedication of the newest dam in the TVA system, the Kentucky Dam, a few weeks ago. He refused to come out for the TVA system of decentralized administration for other river developments. He said, "The procedure of each valley may have to be a little different. The details of administration and control may have to be different." We hope he didn't mean too little different.

Anyway his speech was music to our ears. It means that he still isn't convinced that the TVA policy is the best. If the government goes ahead and develops other valleys with political control in Washington and with the various functions, such as flood control, navigation, irrigation and power generation and distribution all divided up, the thing will go to pot and we'll have our hands on it in no time.

Then there's the Columbia Valley Authority. That doesn't look too good from the standpoint of us contributors to the utility campaign chests. Those people out there in the Northwest have watched Grand Coulee and Bonneville producing and selling cheap power and have allowed themselves to be influenced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a selfish desire to save money on their light bills. There's a disturbing rumor, too, that Secretary of Interior Ickes is becoming disgustingly open-minded about the question of independent authorities and has stopped playing our game of insisting that all these projects be tied up to his department. You can't trust these New Dealers.

But we're picking up steam. I will soon be making contributions to the fight against public power, contributing not only through the money paid for kilowatt hours of electricity but through my expenditures for light bulbs and other electric appliances. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric has recently come forth with an important statement.

He wants "unified action by electric power companies, machinery manufacturers, and electrical manufacturers" to put over our program. With a combination like that we ought to be able to buy up radio time, newspapers, legislatures, professors and text book companies like never before.

I hope nobody gets the notion that I'm being carried away by the great work we're doing and forgetting about Nelson Eddy and how much I'm paying him. I'm a stickler that way. If I contribute to a campaign that will help keep my light bill up I want to know how much I'm contributing.

Labor sets a new strike pattern

U. A. W. Strikes

By Walter W. Ruch

From his column in The New York Times

WITH all of the precision and smoothness of the intricate machines they fashion, the workers of the General Motors Corporation, largest industrial system in the world, went on strike in the first blow in a battle between labor and management over issues involving the whole economic future of the country.

There was no strife-scarred sit-down strike, as in 1937, when a fledging union—now the largest in the world—was testing its strength. It was no head-on and head-shattering strike as that against the Ford Motor Company in 1941, when the "old independent" was forced to its knees.

Even to its "zero hour," fixed so as to make strike action concerted to the same moment throughout the country, "S-Day" by the United Automobile Workers, CIO, reflected months of planning and painstaking provision to guard against every eventuality.

This is not to say that the strike action was deliberate or desired. But it is to say that, since September 18,

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the U.A.W. first made its demand for a blanket wage increase of 30 per cent, skillful strategists working under the untiring leadership of Walter P. Reuther, international vice president of the union and director of the General Motors division, had made themselves and their constituents ready, in every sense, for a strike, should one be ordered.

Although there are more basic industries—coal and steel, for example—in the country, none could surpass the automotive industry in its importance in the national economy. For as the automotive industry in peace-time is steel's best customer, so is steel the best industrial customer of coal. In its larger sense, then, this is an opening wedge, a strike at one and the same time against all the manifold industrial maze of activity which takes its final being in your new Ford, or Buick, or Chevrolet.

It was in this larger sense that any considered appraisal of the strike had to be made. There was no blood running over the cobblestones, there were no pickets armed with clubs and no police officers on the alert with "tommy" guns and riot sticks. This was a battle of wits and psychology worthy of the tremendous stakes.

The U.A.W. was demanding patently far more than an increase of 30 per cent in wages. It was stressing hidden issues—the right to examine the books of the corporation to determine the ability to pay and the necessity for keeping prices down, the right to insist that future labor-management negotiations be held in the open, and the right to hitch wages to profits, to the ability to pay.

These, perhaps more than the 30 per cent, were the things the union wanted. For the U.A.W. stated that if upon examination of the company's proof, i.e., its books, it could be shown that less than 30 per cent would have to be accepted unless prices were to be raised, then the union would scale down its demands.

Without making any attempt to evaluate the strategic positions of both sides, it can be stated that the psychological warfare conducted in advance of the strike by the union has been most effective. Mr. Reuther has been eloquent, to say the least, in making his position clear. His press representatives have tracked down visiting newspaper reporters to make certain that the abundance of material flowing from U.A.W. headquarters was reaching them in full.

Columns of figures, surrounded by thousands of words of textual matter, have been used by the union to present its case. Right or wrong, it has been presented, nay, thrust upon anyone who would listen.

If only by contrast, the union has scored in this connection. The corporation has been reticent to present its case and at the very beginning it was maneuvered into the unenviable position of opposing admission of the press and the public to the meetings of the negotiators.

The strike could last a long time. Neither side could have selected a better time for it. Witness the ability of the company to remain idle for a full year without a loss if it passed its preferred stock dividend requirements, simply through the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

income—up to $160,000,000—it would receive in the form of rebates from its excess profits tax payments during the war.

Witness, too, the fact that the union has a strike fund of more than $500,000, even larger resources in the hands of the various locals, the unified support of other U.A.W. departments and C.I.O. unions and about $100,000,000 in the hands of its members in the form of war bonds. The last item figures about $500 a worker.

Both, then, are "well heeled" for the long fight.

The union strategy, as has been repeatedly stressed in daily accounts of the strike, is one of "divide and conquer." This over-all plan was announced in September at a meeting of the international legislative board in Flint and is now being put into effect.

Briefly, that plan is:

(1) Take on one company at a time, with the biggest—General Motors—the primary target.

(2) Close down the companies, one at a time, meanwhile giving unparalleled productive efforts to the competitors of the struck company.

There were, however, a few flies beginning to show up in this ointment. For example, the union apparently did not take into account the fact that General Motors not only was the largest producer of parts for other manufacturers, but was the largest buyers of parts from the various supplying companies.

Cut off from needed parts other companies could not for long hope to keep up production, whether or not the union willed it. Cut off from orders from General Motors, other producers of parts soon would find it unprofitable to remain in operation, industry spokesmen said.

As another example, union hopes of making a separate peace with Ford have been shattered. Ford has not only refused to consider a wage increase of any sort at this time, but has presented to the union 31 counter demands, the cumulative effect of which would be to provide the company, in its own words, with the same security against the union as the U.A.W. now enjoys against the company.

The strike was called when General Motors failed, by November 20, to reply to a demand by the union that it state its position regarding voluntary submission of the dispute to arbitration.

The company met the deadline with an acknowledgment of receipt of the union proposal, but stated that its answer would not be ready until November 24. It was.

As had been expected, the company rejected the proposal lock, stock and barrel, because, to have accepted, it would have had to concede major issues to the union by agreeing that the arbitration board could open its books, make pay increases retroactive to September 18 and recommend that not only price increases be refused, but that prices, if it were found warranted, be cut in spite of any increase in wages.

The union suggestion was called, by Harry W. Anderson, vice president of General Motors in charge of labor relations, a demand not to arbitrate but to abdicate.

Thus far apart stood the rivals in the momentous battle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Last rites for the family stove

Exit Behemoth

By Don Rose

From his column in The Evening Bulletin

THERE is a phrase of Byron that "nothing dies but something mourns." It is consoling to share a sorrow with a friendly ear, so you may pardon me while I weep for a faithful friend who has passed away. Not far away, because some of the old gas stove is still standing beside the kitchen door and nobody is willing to carry it any farther.

Somebody in need of a second-hand gas stove may be on the way by now to take ours away. Call him back and tell him to relax. The discarded gas stove, 20 years ago, was possibly the largest piece of domestic machinery ever constructed. The gentlemen who put in the new one broke fingernails and smashed knuckles trying to get the old one out of the kitchen and then gave up. "Do you mind if we knock off the fittings?" they asked. Nobody minded, so they whacked off half a ton of hardware and carried the rest through the kitchen door.

I have been pondering how we inserted the stove into the kitchen 20 years ago. Did we buy a stove and then build a kitchen around it? Or was the stove constructed from sheet metal in the middle of the kitchen floor? Possibly the door has shrunk, or the stove has gained weight and girth, as many people do in their advancing years. Whatever the reason, the result is that only the skeleton of a stove stands outside the kitchen door, hard by nine bushels of broken pipes and fittings.

What is to be done with the skeleton? I find myself sympathizing with those who are trying to clean up the mess left by the war. How do they dispose of a second-hand 60-ton tank? You can sink an obsolete battleship in deep water, but there is no place within many miles to drown a discarded gas stove.

Next spring the stove might be set in the garden, planted with morning glories and rambler roses. Laughing children would play around its legs, singing birds and twittering field mice might nest in its ovens. Imperceptibly, within a few thousand years, the stove would return to original chaos.

But there is a long winter ahead and the stove stands naked and ugly by the kitchen door. What is needed is a small atomic bomb which would gently blow the stove back where it came from (resolving it into an assortment of infinitesimal molecules). But there is a better idea. The idea is to borrow hammers and crowbars and issue them to the grandchildren. The children would then be left in the vicinity of the stove, and nature would be allowed to take its course. In a few hours there would be no gas stove.

© 1945, by Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I remember a bright cold Cambridge windy morning
With slow gulls over the four-towered bridge of stone.
The old man told me who taught me what I am learning
That he walked his troubles over the bridge alone.

* * *

Troubled and warm and wise is the way I saw him
In a story of walking from shore to further shore.
There was nothing here, and little there to draw him
Far under or far over the gray waters any more.

* * *

Then on the long bridge a man was coming nearer,
As if between two worlds two lost souls met.
The poet, the beggar. A great poet, a drunken beggar,
And what good was it either one of them could get?

* * *

But the lost man knew the lost man, no name spoken.
One lost toward heaven and little he could say,
One guessing a greatness time would never darken,
And saying so, but going the other way.

—*JOHN HOLMES*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

By Jasper R. Lewis

TWO VIEWS OF BIG BUSINESS

Private Monopoly. The Enemy At Home. By David Lasser. (Harper's, $3.00).

It is Lasser's theory that the cause of the world's unrest, two global wars and general revolt of the masses, lies principally in the struggle of monopolists (the gigantic industrial organizations) to preserve themselves against the rising tide of democracy. In support of this he reviews the story of the internal affairs of Germany, France, Spain and England, to show how the entrenched capitalists aided or abetted the cause of the dictators, in the belief that by so doing they were preventing the further spread of economic equalization.

The first line of defense of monopoly, the cartel system, was well developed by the Germans, but the British and American companies did their part. The big industries making up the system utilized domestic depression to press the cause of the group most likely to reciprocate. Not only in the Axis countries, but even in Chamberlain's England, Lasser feels this theory held good.

Here in America the big "trusts" use the same tactics, in other guises. It is only in Russia, to which he appears partial, that a different practice exists; it is state controlled "elastic security."

There is much factual reporting in the book, and there is also much that is controversial or merely opinion. Some of his statements are documented; others are quotations from *PM* or other newspapers. Perhaps the greatest fault is that he conveys the impression that monopolies are like feudal families, reigning unquestioned in definite zones. In spots this may be literally so; he mentions life insurance companies, in particular the mutuals, owned by policyholders but controlled by families in perpetuity. His suggested cure of democratization of all these organizations might well apply in that field. The same theory is hardly true in other spheres; competition has caused the rise of able men from the ranks. Every so often a small company or individual makes the top grade and becomes big business. To accuse all these of being monopolists or grasping capitalists is true only in the sense that every worker seeks profit, the more the better.

His recommendations for these evils are pretty well defined within the aims of New Deal leaders. Public spending to avoid unemployment is one of them; benefits should not be less than $20 nor more than $35 weekly. With all due concern for those who sincerely want work and cannot find it, there are millions of middle class people who remember the leaf-raking and other devices of the thirties. Lasser's interest in the unemployed is laudable; his faith in human nature unwarranted. A floor of $2500 yearly income is very nice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to contemplate, the rise in cost of living resulting is another matter. An estimate of Lasser's social views may be formed from his opinion that "It (PM) is by all odds . . . the most vital paper in America."

This is not to decry the benefit to be attained by reading the book. There is much in it of interest to the man in the street, who probably won't believe it even if it is true. Big business, or monopoly, is responsible for many evils which need correcting, but it is also responsible for many and miraculous advances. Lasser does not give the devil his due.

Big Business in a Democracy. By James Truslow Adams. (Scribner's, $2.75).

Much more in harmony with American life and living, as we know it, is this estimate of big business in America, not because it is by Adams, but because the articles of American faith in individual ambition and ability are part of the author's credo. Another sound reason is his early statement that the inference is that the injustices of the day can be corrected by the "'passage of a few laws—and the creation perhaps of a new crop of political jobs." His attitude would be described by social workers as bourgoisie. For him the profit motive is deeply rooted in man, and talk will not eradicate it. Nor, as he points out, has rugged individualism prevented general social advancement; that is evidenced by the very cry for further democratization.

Adams traces briefly the beginning of man's development of business from Sumerian and Babylonian times to show that it is something which has grown with man's progress through increasingly complex civilization. The desire for gain has prompted many an invention which has added to man's comforts. You have already guessed that Adams is a believer in American big business, and is seeking to justify his belief. With all its sins, it still has much to its credit. The growth of business has been the cause of diversification of employment and of wants, the broadening of life, and an increase in incentive to work. The capitalist is not pictured as unselfish and ungreedy; his sins throughout American history are well known, but periodically when property tended to become too much like privilege, there has been revolt in thought and deed.

For his concrete example of bigness, he selects General Motors; in 1944 it employed nearly half a million people, had nearly as many stockholders, and its volume of business was $4,250,000,000. After its formative years, its capital came from profits; "from *brains* in a *machine* age, and from producing something for the masses in a *mass* age." There is a world of meaning in that sentence. Many of the executives came up from the lower ranks, through ability only. The most striking thing about this part of the book is the description of how GM has been integrated into the economic life of the country by its spread in many fields, frequently in advancement in essentials.

Thus Adams shows that big business, beside being profitable, can contribute to the general improvement of the status of the masses, in the provision of greater conveniences.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That volume produces lower costs is admitted. Big business does that, and in addition has the money with which to finance further research, which in turn pays dividends to industry and to the public in comfort.

The author's opinions on the labor problem, as exemplified by GM, are those of the average non-union citizen. Responsibility of unions is a much discussed topic now, and currently there is a strike at GM's plants. This, however, is a matter of negotiation looking to greater returns for labor, and the unholiness or sanctity of big business is not the question.

Finally, Adams re-iterates his hope that America will continue its free, individualistic pattern of life, paying his respects to those who insist a paternal government must nurse its citizens throughout (incidentally making fat jobs for more bureaucrats). Official help and guidance are fine, but the management of industry should be out of government hands. Adams probably speaks for the average American worker, including perhaps a majority of those who work with their hands, want a profit for their work and see no evil in management's expectation of profit also.

BRIEFER COMMENT

EDUCATIONAL

Sam A. Lewisohn, who in his spare time is president of the Miami Copper Company, offers some serious comments on small business and large in *Human Leadership in Industry* (Harper's, $2.00). He also considers the problems confronting labor and management, the sensible way of attaining cooperation between the two and some reflections on the need of understanding how to handle men in industry. This is one of the basic requirements for supervisory personnel. He is confident that American business will overcome the post-war challenge; it is re-assuring to find an executive like Lewisohn alert to the trend of labor.

Modern Man Is Obsolete, by Norman Cousins (Viking, $1.00), is one of the briefest, sanest expositions of the problems confronting man in this beginning of the atomic age. In plain English he analyzes succinctly what is wrong with *homo sapiens,* and suggests the courses he may take from here on—to ultimate peace and international harmony, or to extinction. "The primary aim should be the development of a critical intelligence;" that is a short sentence, but covers an infinity of ideas. Man is obsolete in the sense that he himself is far behind civilization. Cousins' notably clear and level-headed essay is a distinct contribution to the task of bringing man up to date.

This is history, too, history of lives which together make up a country. *A Nation of Nations,* by Louis Adamic (Harper's, $3.50), relates the melting-pot stories of immigrants from all over the world who have blended into the America of today, and of native born minorities. It makes a formidable argument against the cant of self-styled America-firsters, and an imposing bible for liberals and humanitarians everywhere. It has a definite objective, and it achieves it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BIOGRAPHICAL

The oddities and the sparkle of Irvin Cobb are recalled, with a touch of nostalgia, naturally, in *My Wayward Parent,* A Book About Irvin S. Cobb, by Elisabeth Cobb (Bobbs-Merrill, $2.50). The many who knew the writer only from his work will smile again at his whimsical antics, or experience a moment of regret at some of the serious spots. His daughter has written about him in a book that is in keeping with the man, humorous and sad, facetious and serious. Cobb's instructions for his funeral, typical of his life's attitude, close the delightful volume.

WAR

It is probably in many minds that the trial of war criminals is something unnecessary; something that a German victory would not have bothered with. Yet the reasons for them are made clear as one reads *Germany's War Crimes and Punishment,* by M. H. Myerson (Macmillan, $2.75). The author is a Canadian lawyer, and presents the legal aspects of the problem, treating the nation's crimes in war much as he would an individual's crime, but citing international law and its development to show the necessity for the trials. He is firm in his opinion that the guilty should suffer the full penalties. He is hopeful of the future of those Germans who honestly merit consideration, but he is adamant against softening now that the war is over. The language is not legalistic, the reasoning is logical and for a clear perception of the situation the book is recommended.

The life story of the aircraft carrier *Essex* and her crew is told in *Well Done,* by Morris Markey (Appleton-Century, $2.75), and it is well told. As a correspondent Markey made himself a part of the crew, and from his talks with the men, and from incidents he witnessed, he brings the tale right to your eyes. At sea and in the engagements at Saipan and Iwo Jima, the *Essex* did her bit. This is Markey's tribute to his shipmates.

The varied duties performed by the United States Coast Guard in World War II are delineated in *Sea, Surf and Hell* (Prentice-Hall, $3.00). It is a collection of chapters reprinted from various publications, and some original contributions, all testifying to the work of the Coast Guard. Some of the incidents are routine, but others are exciting. There is also a Coast Guard chronology and a glossary of nautical terms.

Primarily a record, and a graphic one, of his experiences in Germany after dropping from a crippled bomber, *Parachute to Berlin,* by Lowell Bennett (Vanguard, $2.50), tells what is both a gruesome and an engrossing story. His emotions on viewing the effects of Allied bombing, or rather experiencing them as a prisoner of the Germans, are sharply portrayed. There is more than that in the book; he decries the indiscriminate "morale" bombing as having an opposite effect, and he accuses Allied fliers, particularly the RAF, of bombing to raze cities, and not to destroy military targets. In this protest to the idea of general bombing, this NS correspondent offers something to think about.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

THE desultory nature of our first post-war season was alleviated by the arrival of *State Of The Union* in Manhattan after an eminently satisfactory tryout tour. Since the antics and much of the meaning of the comedy revolve around pre-election maneuvering by which presidents are chosen, the Washington opening was the social event of the month. The sallies of wit found an easy mark in the politically sophisticated audiences of the capital. Since, however, the authors' most earnest concern was reserved for issues of reconversion and national unity, they decided to beard these raging lions in their dens and took the play to Detroit. They expected trouble in that center of industrial and racial disturbances where trouble has long been brewing. The reception there was excellent and newspaper editorials greeted this airing of paramount problems.

State Of The Union is a disarmingly simple story. The successful industrialist Grant Matthews is primed for the presidential nomination by Jim Conover, a Republican political boss, and Grant's mistress Kay Thorndyke, who owns a chain of Republican newspapers. Grant's popularity was earned by his part in the war effort and he seems a likely candidate to Conover, who sizes up the situation realistically when he explains the difference between the Democratic and Republican parties: "There is all the difference in the world; they are in and we are out."

Conover is doomed to see his hopes blasted. First he discovers Grant's affair with Kay and tries to scotch the scandal by bringing the estranged wife Mary Matthews to the scene. Then the politician is hoist with his own petard, when the wife turns out to be what mistresses are supposed to be—an attractive woman who wants to draw the best out of her man, keeps him on his toes, and tries to wean him from staid respectability. Before long, Grant, who goes on a pre-election tour with her, is made aware of the compromises expected of him, is hemmed in so that he will not commit himself too forthrightly to any issue, and is expected to cater to industrial bourbons. Worse than that, he is slated to become the pawn of discord-sowing organizations that will set foreign-born populations against each other, disuniting America and affecting all-important international relations. The wife does her best to open his eyes and battles the insidious influences which affect his rather vain character. She loses out temporarily to the mistress, is driven desperate, disgraces herself at a political conclave with too much elbow-bending, but wins out at the end, with the aid of her husband's essential decency and their resuscitated love. In conclusion, Grant Matthews upsets the political apple-cart, sacrificing his chances for the nomination.

This story could well have been a humdrum affair. Instead, except for some tedious speechifying, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

results are delightful domestic comedy and barbed political satire. The play is greatly helped by Leland Hayward's theatre-wise production. The direction by Bretaine Windust is generally satisfactory. The cast is excellent in all respects. Minor Watson makes a convincing political boss, conservative without stuffiness, slick without cheapness—in short, a politico whose influence is wholly credible and therefore to be dreaded. Myron McCormick, one of our ablest actors, evokes the very archetype of agile newspapermen who serve their masters with cynicism but also with rueful respect for the rare phenomenon of decency in politics. Ralph Bellamy, back in the fold since playing the professor in *Tomorrow The World,* creates a solid characterization in the role of Grant Matthews, honorable but fallible presidential timber. And Ruth Hussey, a fugitive from Hollywood, makes her "What Every Woman Knows" role a sheer delight, combining piquant femininity with fundamental earnestness.

Most of the credit, however, belongs to the writing team of Russell Crouse and Howard Lindsay, who seem to possess infallible showmanship. Their partnership started a decade ago. It has been jolted by only one pardonable failure, *Strip For Action.* Their joint efforts reached their peak with the dramatization of *Life With Father.* The authors have reached another peak with *State Of The Union,* the most intelligent and lively comedy of the season, and they have done so by capitalizing on their separate and combined talents and temperaments. Crouse is an ex-newspaperman, columnist, author of Americana and former press representative for the Theatre Guild. He is endowed with wit and humor; he is Puck with a heart. Lindsay is a born actor (his Father Day is one of the memorable stage characterizations of our time), and is the possessor of a saturnine temperament and an earnest spirit. Both men know the score in politics, and are firmly planted on the progressive side of the fence.

Their play is topical, and its topicality leads to some superficiality and considerable contrivance. *State Of The Union* is not for the ages, though it makes us hope that the Union will be for the ages. It is plain that they had to calculate how much seriousness an audience could take without blinking, that they resorted to the bare tricks of showmanship whenever they anticipated a lull, that they deliberated geniality when they were on the verge of fury and teetered on the brink of a soapbox. Some of their laughter seems too easily bought, especially when they resort to topical references and bring in Dewey and Hoover for a laugh. It is also true that they wind up their play with a rather hastily managed last-minute redemption of their hero.

Their play is, in short, fairly transparent. But its transparency is luminous whenever they touch upon human relations, which they do very ably in the James M. Barrie manner without the James M. Barrie mannerisms; and even when the glow is fainter we find more revealing light on matters of immediate moment than is customary. Moreover, and this is no small virtue, Messrs. Crouse and Lindsay

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make no pretensions to anything other than transparency. They are not inviting us to expect passion or profundity. They follow an elementary rule so frequently overlooked by other playwrights—namely, that the depths had better be left alone when they cannot be plumbed and that the heights should not be scaled with inadequate equipment. They also know that exhortation must not be monotonous or obvious, that profundities do not mix well with the ingredients of ordinary politics, and that the butterflies of the national scene should not be broken on torturous wheels.

This knowledge has eluded other playwrights who have had their say recently, and a conspicuous example is *The Rugged Path,* by Robert Sherwood. Recently relieved of his important duties with the OWI, Sherwood has returned to the theatre with the same convictions that made him leave it at the height of his career after *Abe Lincoln In Illinois* and *There Shall Be No Night.* Sherwood made his mark originally in the 'twenties with sophisticated comedies like *The Road To Rome* and *Reunion In Vienna.* The 'thirties deepened him. They brought him to the despair of *The Petrified Forest,* in which he envisioned an enfeebled civilization surrendering to "the ape-men" represented by the gangsters of his plot, and of *Idiot's Delight,* in which he tolled the bell for a world moving relentlessly toward suicidal war. His spirits rallied, however, and he arrived at the affirmative position of his later plays. He flung himself into the struggle against isolationism with all the zeal of a convert, lent the late President his able pen, and served the war effort without stint and with great ability.

The American theatre has every right to be proud of Robert Sherwood. But it has little cause for rejoicing over his apparently hastily patched together play. It throws some searing light on the conflict between ownership and journalism when it shows an idealistic editor resigning in protest against the "business-first" isolationism of the management. But thereafter *The Rugged Path* becomes a diffuse chronicle of the editor's adventures on a destroyer (as a *cook*—for an untenable reason) and on a South Pacific island where he meets his death. The presumption is that his isolationist family, the vacillatious newspaper owner who is his brother-in-law, and the wife who misunderstood him, have been proved wrong, and that they have no right to his posthumous honors.

The first half of the play is verbosely static and obvious. The rest is actively adventurous—and obvious. The first half revives arguments with which we are much too familiar, and without extending them into the formative post-war period. The second half has some superficially exciting scenes, such as the sinking of a destroyer which was superbly staged by Garson Kanin, who has just left the service after collecting the honors of a lifetime for his direction of the notable screen documentary *The True Glory.* But these adventures are only loosely related to what came before, and also too recognizably familiar after so many war films which did the job much better. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real gratification to be derived from the production is Spencer Tracy's performance. Although it doesn't differ in characterization and tone from his screen personality, Tracy's acting has the right accent of informal humanity and decency which has made him a household name. Sherwood has made editorial, largely passionless, prose of a noble theme.

At the other extreme, a new Philadelphia playwright, Harry Kleiner, went overboard in *Skydrift* from an excess of pity and passion. He was deeply concerned with the victims of the war, the men who died and the people they left behind. He had noble and touching things to say and show. He was betrayed to some degree by a poorly directed production, but also by his own undisciplined pathos, which misdirected his vigorous, meaningful writing—this in a framework of familiar fantasy when he resurrected his para-marines for the purpose of visiting the living. Probably Mr. Kleiner would have fared better if his play had been unveiled before the end of the war. Our frame of mind would have been sufficiently close to his to make us less sensible of his over-intensity, and in this sense his play is as much of a war casualty as his characters. Nevertheless, he has the true fire of a poet and the dramatic imagination of a playwright, even if his talent in this direction seems to be somewhat too cinematic. He ought to do better in his next bout with the refractory theatre.

Concerning other events there is less to report. *The Rich Full Life,* Vina Delmar's new play, was smothered in saccharine. That the young need fun as well as work is a theme too obvious to require a play, especially when it is spread so thinly except for the jam of parental concern, which is spread too thickly.

The Margaret Webster production of *The Tempest* was revived at the New York City Center, and, although it had several cast changes, seemed as good as new—which is considerably better than currently written plays. Two new musicals, which will be discussed in a later issue, are moderably acceptable: *Are You With* It, in the tradition of the circus musical, and *The Day Before Spring,* in the tradition of the college musical, revolving around a woman's faintly Freudian fantasy of what might have happened if she had gone through with an elopement. Of the two, *Are You With It* has more crudities but more bounce. *The Day Before Spring* is more "finished", having been produced by John C. Wilson, who has a well-earned reputation for professional finesse and competence.

• One of the best "survivor" stories of the war has been related by a submarine officer who returned from a hair-raising experience at sea with this little gem:

"We crash-dived and watched the gauges with anxious eyes. Depth charges were popping too close for comfort. We expected the lights to go out at any moment. Suddenly the sub's cook rushed into the control room:

"'For cripes sake,' he yelled, 'you've got to do something about that destroyer. My bread's falling!'"

—*Great Lakes Bulletin*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGHLIGHTIN

International Scene

In Nuremburg's Palace of Justice, just a month after the United Nations' Indictment of the Nazi War Criminals was given to the International Military Tribunal, 20 such Nazis went on trial for their lives. Four other defendants named in the indictment were missing: Dr. Robert Ley, who committed suicide; Martin Bormann, who will be tried "in absentia" and Ernest Kaltenbrunner and Gustav Krupp, who are ill. The others, however, were all there, considerably less arrogant and impressive than in the days of Hitler's glory—Hermann Goering, slightly thinner; Rudolph Hess, temporarily feigning amnesia; Joachim von Ribbentrop, worn and haggard; Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, still the German officer; Alfred Rosenberg, shabbily dressed; and the rest.

The trial opened on November 20 with a four-hour oration by Justice H. Jackson, American prosecutor. He expounded his theory that international law, like domestic common law, must grow from unprecedented, bold judicial decisions. Here the defendants paid close attention. "International law, natural law, German law, any law at all, was to these men simply a propaganda device to be invoked when it helped and to be ignored when it would condemn what they wanted to do," Jackson declared. International law was to be administered on an unprecedented scale, Jackson went on to say. "If there is no law now under which to try these people, it is about time the human race made some." To the accusations contained in the 25,000 word indictment, read aloud in court, all the defendants answered "not guilty." The small group of defense lawyers, however, was not hopeful. One of them admitted good naturedly that he was just a Nuremberg "ambulance chaser."

The "Nazi conspirators," as they are legally termed, have good reason to despair. Never before have men been called upon to answer for such crimes on so vast a scale. Bales of evidence against them have been carried into court—captured German films, secret orders from Hitler to his confidantes—but mostly well-known history in documented form. In the proceedings several interesting facts have come to light. Hitler had been urging Japan to go to war since 1938. He and the Japanese foreign minister concluded a pact in February, 1941, pledging that once Japan had begun a war against the United States, Germany would strike without delay. Also disclosed was a Japanese plot to assassinate Stalin and the first evidence that Hindenburg's will approving Hitler's dictatorship was forged.

In addition to the American section of the case—conspiracy against the peace-making individuals responsible for that "crime against humanity" —the defendants will be charged with waging of aggressive war; viola-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of war customs, such as killing war prisoners; murder and enslavemen of populations. Each of the latter counts will be under the direction of the British, Russian and French prosecutors respectively; namely, Sir Hartley Shawcross, R. Rudenko and Francois de Menthon.

SEETHING NATIONALISM

While internationalists establish new and far-reaching concepts of international law, nationalists in the Far and Near East staged a series of armed rebellions.

Despite the attempts of Netherlands and British authorities to open negotiations, the nationalists in Indonesia have refused to bargain peaceably. For them, force still speaks louder than reason. Force, however, works both ways. British Indian troops (Dutch forces on Java are still negligible) captured Surabaya on November 29 after a bloody 19-day battle. Heavy fighting continued to rage on other parts of the island as additional British naval and air forces were brought into play. Unrest spread to the neighboring island of Sumatra, which the British had first reported as being quiet.

After assuming the premiership of the unrecognized Indonesian Republic and taking over all but President Achmed Soekarno's title, Sutan Sjahrir, a moderate socialist, has announced that he was prepared to resume talks with the Dutch and the British. Dr. Hubertus van Mook, Acting Governor General for the Netherlands Indies, had formerly offered the Indonesians "partnership" in the Netherlands Empire but this offer had been rejected. The Dutch also have said that they will not negotiate until hostilities have ceased. On the other hand, an Indonesian spokesman has asserted that "when the Dutch give the order for the cessation of the burning of our villages and the murdering of our people, then we shall be willing to talk with them."

Strangely enough, the Japanese have a two-fold part in the Indonesian revolt. Under the slogan, "Asia for the Asiatics," the Japanese fanned long-smouldering resentments against Dutch, French and British rule. When the natives saw how easily the Japanese conquered south east Asia, they realized the European hold on them was not unbreakable. Further, there is evidence of Japanese influence in the tactics of the native troops. On the other hand, now that rebellion has broken out, some of the Japanese find themselves in a contrary position. About 500,000 Japanese troops are being used to quell the revolt.

To the west, Azerbaijan nationalists have staged an uprising in Iran. Bordering on the Soviet Union and Turkey, this northwesternmost province of Iran was the scene of an armed outburst against the central Iranian government. At the beginning of the revolt, which started on November 23, communications between Teheran, the capital, and Azerbaijan were sev-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ered, four towns were captured and four others surrounded. Ten days later the Iranian governor of Maraghen in Azerbaijan was assassinated by the rebels, supposedly members of the Democratic party.

The newly formed Democratic party, the force behind the revolt, is the successor to the Tudeb (Masses) party, which had formerly been active in Iran under Soviet auspices. These rebels are seeking economic and governmental reforms with increased autonomy for the province. But behind the uprising is a red shadow. Hussein Ala, Iran's new Ambassador to the United States, has charged that the Azerbaijan revolt is being engineered by the Soviet Union; "This so-called revolution or separatist movement doesn't in the least represent the feelings of the people." The Iranian government has protested that its troops were prevented by Red Army forces from entering Azerbaijan.

Being the fourth largest producer of oil, Iran has long been the meeting place of British and Russian interests. During the war, it was through Iran that the "bridge of victory" carried supplies from the United States into the Soviet Union. On January 29, 1942, a treaty of alliance was signed among the three governments guaranteeing Iran's political independence and territorial integrity. In light of the present situation the United States suggested to co-signers Great Britain and Soviet Russia that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Iran by January 1, instead of March, 1946. The message was a statement of this country's intentions toward Iran and a tactful reminder of the obligations assumed by the Soviet Union and Great Britain. At this writing, reports from Russia indicate that she has rejected the United States' proposal but has mentioned that she will take no part in political events of northern Iran.

Still farther to the west, conflicting Jewish and Arab nationals once more broke into rioting in *Palestine.* Disorder centered around the Jewish Tel Aviv, where, in the middle of November, a few persons were killed, scores of others wounded and much damage was done to British property. The outbreak of violence came on the heels of British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's statement of policy in Palestine. He proposed, and the United States accepted the proposal, that an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry be named to determine the facts in the Palestine issue and make interim and long-tern recommendations. The proposal itself was in response to a suggestion made by President Truman on August 31 that permission be granted for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. Instead of quieting potential disorder, however, Mr. Bevin's statement brought out the fighting spirit of both sides. Following the formation of a 12-man Higher Committee (always an emergency committee), the Palestine Arabs let the world know that they were united and were ready to prosecute their cause.

Meanwhile the Big Five powers are preparing to take up this ever-present Zionist-Arab problem in Palestine. Russia was reported to have suggested that the United States, Great Britain, France and China meet with her in an effort to solve that problem as well as others, dormant and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

active, in the Near East. President Truman announced that he was no longer in favor of establishing a Palestine Jewish Commonwealth because, since he originally supported the measure, conditions had changed.

THE ATOMIC PLAN

On November 15, after five days of conferences among President Truman and Prime Ministers Clement Attlee and William Mackenzie King, the fate of the dread weapon was announced. The plan centered on three main points. (1) The secrets of the manufacture of the atomic bomb are to be kept by the United States, Great Britain and Canada until adequate international controls over atomic energy are effected. (2) A special commission is to be set up to establish the controls, outlaw the bomb as a weapon and insure the use of atomic energy "only for peaceful purposes." This commission will be under the United Nations Organization and will have the right of inspection in all countries, to protect complying states against "violations and evasions" of the agreement. (3) The United States, Britain and Canada are to approve a policy for a free exchange of scientific knowledge, in the hope that other nations will follow suit, "thereby creating an atmosphere of reciprocal confidence."

Just when "effective enforceable safeguards against its [the atomic bomb's] use for destructive purposes" can be devised is still a problem. But a more important one is Russia. The nature of Russia's response could very well determine the success or failure of the plan. Atomic control is on the agenda of the meeting of the American, British and Soviet foreign secretaries to be held in Moscow, December 15.

DE GAULLE AND THE COMMUNISTS

In the middle of November the Constituent Assembly unanimously elected General Charles de Gaulle President of the French Republic and directed him to form an interim government. This assembly had been elected on October 21 and consisted of 153 Communists, 143 Socialists, 138 Mouvement Republican Populaire and 125 from minor parties. When De Gaulle started naming his cabinet ministers, as directed, the Communists rose up in violent protest. In view of their number, they demanded one of three major cabinet positions—Foreign affairs, War or the Interior —a post which De Gaulle refused to give them. Backed by the Mouvement Républican Populaire, he was afraid to appoint a Communist to a "policy-making" position lest this act be taken as favoring Russia. When the impasse could not be broken, De Gaulle stepped down from his position. At first there was rumor of his resignation but De Gaulle himself explained that it was a move to test the confidence of the assembly in him. On November 19, the Socialists joined the MRP members and the rest of the assembly and again asked him to form a government. The political crisis over, De Gaulle proceeded under his prerogatives and presented his legislative program. In domestic affairs, he asked for nationalization of credit, electricity and insurance, re-organization of the army and the judiciary and a sound budget. In foreign affairs, he re-declared French sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

port of the United Nations Organization and announced that France wanted to be a "link" between the nations in the east and the west.

Two weeks after this political tension, the assembly overwhelmingly passed a bill nationalizing the Bank of France and four other private banks. Once again France was pursuing normal political activities.

ENDURANCE TEST

The Communist Chief of Staff predicts a minimum of ten years civil war in China if there is a complete break between his party and the Chinese National government. The Communists, as well as their adversaries, hope a peaceful solution will come out of the conference scheduled to meet in Chungking in the near future. Meanwhile fighting continues to ravage north China, particularly Manchuria. Reports on the progress of either side are usually clouded. Both sides have a policy of publicizing defeat rather than victory so that the enemy will appear to be the attacker and the provoker of war.

REPUBLICAN YUGOSLAVIA

"The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia" was proclaimed on November 29 by the Constituent Assembly meeting in Belgrade. Exiled since 1941, King Peter promptly issued a statement expressing his grief and his refusal to accept the decision. But his reign was over. The action climaxed a four-year struggle between Serbian nationalists supporting the king and pan-Slavic revolutionary forces which developed from the resistance movement.

The Domestic Scene

"A monarchy," said Fisher Ames in the eighteenth century, "is a merchantman, which sails well, but will sometimes strike on a rock and go to the bottom; while a republic is a raft, which would never sink, but then, your feet are always in water."

Regardless of the direction in which one looked last month, there was strife. The football field was not the only arena of Army-Navy animosity; Democrats and Republicans squabbled over Pearl Harbor guilt; employer and employee glared at each other through the picket line; envoys and the State Department were at loggerheads over American policy in China.

Those who despaired could think only of adjourning to a peaceful South Sea island. Those who appreciated the democratic process regarded it as a healthy sign; when the quarrels cease, when the ship sails with the passengers unable to find or voice complaints, then is the time to post look-outs for reefs.

HURLEY-BURLEY IN CHINA

The long-simmering Chinese pot exploded on November 27. The public first sensed that American far eastern policy involved more than met the eye when General Stilwell was recalled from the Eastern theatre last year for refusing to become embroiled in the Chungking-Communist struggle. The use of American troops in Manchuria in November indicated on which horse our State Department has placed its money.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The submerged controversial opinions were brought into the open with the dramatic resignation of Major General Patrick Hurley as the American Ambassador to China. His resignation was accompanied by a blistering denunciation of the way our foreign policy was being administered by "professional diplomats," in particular, those on the lower levels.

Did Hurley object to the use of American troops in China's civil war? Emphatically not! Rather, he was bitter at the support certain State Department officials were supposedly giving to the Chinese Communists. He also objected to the manner in which he thought other nations were cutting in on us in the Far East. "America has been excluded economically from every part of the world controlled by colonial imperialism and communist imperialism. America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interests. This is chargeable to a weak foreign service."

The erstwhile Ambassador said that he had no quarrel with the President or the various Secretaries of State, but maintained that he had been double-crossed by his subordinates at the Chungking Embassy and in the State Department.

President Truman moved swiftly when he heard of the Hurley statement. General George C. Marshall, hot from his position as Chief of Staff, was appointed as the President's special envoy to China, with the rank of Ambassador. The choice of Marshall indicated the importance which the administration places on the Chinese situation.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was not slow to announce that it will investigate Hurley's charges that minor diplomats sabotaged our Chinese policy by playing colonial imperialists against Chinese Communists to weaken the Chungking regime. And Representative Curtis of Nebraska demanded that Secretary of State Byrnes fire every "communist and near communist" in the State Department, naming seven high department officials eligible, in his opinion, for the axe.

CHANGING OF THE GUARD

When General Marshall stepped down as Chief of Staff, he looked forward to a well-earned rest, only to be rushed to China. He was named Chief of Staff in 1939, when the Army numbered 180,000. He saw it grow to 8,300,000. His successor, 55-year-old General Dwight Eisenhower, was a lieutenant colonel when the war started, and his leadership in Africa and Europe made him a national hero. Equally important, he is as popular with congressmen as was his predecessor, whose relations with Capitol Hill were excellent.

Admiral Ernest J. King also headed his branch of the service during its unprecedented growth and supervised the virtual rebuilding of our naval power. Both King and Marshall accepted invitations to stay on long after passing the retirement age. Like Marshall, however, King last month left his post. His successor is 60-year-old Admiral Chester Nimitz, victorious commander of our Pacific fleet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED WE STAND?

Unification of the armed forces has been a perennial debate during the last 20 years. For the first time, however, it looked as though a remote possibility might become a probability. The Senate Military Affairs Committee heard testimony for and against, and whatever cooperation existed between the Army and Navy during war-time appeared to have evaporated in the balmy atmosphere of peace.

Roughly speaking, the Army was for it; the Navy was opposed. And each side brought its heaviest batteries to bear on the other. War heroes and brass hats were rushed home from abroad to testify.

General Eisenhower was the Army's star witness. He was used to bolster the Army on two of its legislative proposals. One day he held forth for two hours before the House Committee considering military training, continually emphasizing the point that next time there will not be time to train men after hostilities start. The following day he testified for an hour on the merger bill, drawing heavily from his experience with unified commands in Europe. Eisenhower gladdened the hearts of congressmen by stating that, besides stepping up the efficiency of the services during hostilities, the unification would reduce the number of men needed to do the fighting by 25 per cent.

The Army called a galaxy of stars to strengthen its case. General Devers testified that cooperation was "notoriously bad" in 1941, and that the separation of the services had caused a serious waste of time and effort throughout the war. He stated that the two branches competed fiercely for manpower, with the Navy usually grabbing the best men. General Bradley blamed separation of the services for tragedies like the shooting down of Army transport planes by Navy gunners during the Sicilian invasion.

The Navy feared that it would be swallowed up by the much larger Army if the two branches were united. It pointed to such dangers as top-heavy organization, bureaucratic tendencies and power which the combined Chief of Staff would wield.

The Navy's prize star, Admiral Nimitz, was hurried home to counteract General Eisenhower's testimony. Nimitz, however, was in a rather embarrassing position, having approved the unification plan in 1944. In every respect the Admiral contradicted the arguments he had previously made for the merger. He told the committee that his earlier opinions had been formed without chance for adequate study and that his change of mind "represents my conviction based on additional experience and further study of the proposal and its current implications." Nimitz's major contention was that the merger might hinder the Navy and reduce the role of sea power in the country's defense.

Secretary Forrestal, in an effort to halt the present discussions, proposed that a committee of prominent citizens, headed by trouble-shooter Bernard Baruch, be appointed to study the proposed merger. His choice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of words, however, was unfortunate, especially when he spoke of relegating the discussion to "a higher level." Members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee did not take kindly to this remark.

SEPARATING CHAFF FROM GRAIN

In the mass of testimony, innuendo and accusations, the heat generated at the Pearl Harbor investigations produced at least two flashes of light. It was definitely established that the United States had advance knowledge that Japan intended to attack within a matter of days. This information was obtained by cracking the Japanese code as early as December, 1940. The decoded messages revealed that Japan was swiftly preparing for war with the United States and that her spies were constantly sending highly important information to the mother country on American miliary preparations and ship movements. There was, however, little mention of Hawaii in the decoded communications. The Philippines were viewed as the most likely spot for a surprise attack.

The investigating committee was also told by the former chief of Army intelligence that proof that the Japanese planned to attack Pearl Harbor was in the hands of Army and Navy intelligence officers, who didn't realize at the time the import of the messages. Radio messages sent by Japanese agents in Honolulu to Tokyo were intercepted between November 24 and December 6, 1941. The messages, however, were not decoded and translated for many hours, and in some cases for many days, after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The committee was told that the delay was principally due to the lack of trained personnel to decode the messages.

The second major fact established was that the fleet was kept at Pearl Harbor over the Navy's protest at the insistence of President Roosevelt and the State Department. Admiral Richardson, Commander in Chief of the U. S. Fleet in 1940, testified that he had strongly objected to the presence of the Navy in Hawaii, believing that it was just inviting an attack for which neither it nor the nation was prepared. Roosevelt was of a different opinion, however, saying that keeping the fleet in the Pacific would act as a restraining influence. In answer to Richardson's point-blank question, "Are we going to enter the war?", the late President was reported to have answered:

"Not if the Japs attack Thailand, the Kra Isthmus or the Dutch East Indies. Perhaps not even if they attack the Philippines." But he prophesied that the Japanese "could not always avoid making mistakes . . . As the area of operations expanded, soon or later, they would make a mistake and we would enter the war."

Another major witness was Nobel-prize-winner Cordell Hull, who had been accused in the Army-Navy report on Pearl Harbor of issuing an "ultimatum" to Japan on November 26 which caused that country to attack us. Hull was cleared of this charge when it was discovered that on November 5 the Japanese had planned for the attack of December 7. He maintained that not once in the weeks preceding the outbreak of war had he heard any suggestion from a military source that Pearl Harbor was a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely target for attack. His testimony indicated that the Navy, War and State departments were in 1941 looking anxiously towards Burma, the Netherlands Indies, the Philippines and the Russian maritime provinces, but never toward Hawaii.

THE ROAD BACK

The housewife knew that reconversion had actually started when meat, fats, butter and cheese, rationed since April 1, 1943, became available without red points. With the end of rationing of shoes, automobiles, canned foods and gasoline, only sugar, the first commodity to be worth its weight in points, remained on the O.P.A.'s foot ration list. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson announced, when meat returned to the free catch-as-catch-can market, that the move would "in no way" affect plans for overseas shipments to Europe. He reported that, over and above civilian and military requirement, approximately 30,000,000 pounds of meat weekly would be available for shipment abroad.

THE FIGHT IS ON

November 21 saw a skillfully planned campaign ably executed. Over 180,000 General Motors employees in 20 states quietly left their work benches when the eleven o'clock whistle blew, and thus started an all-out fight between two titans. A compromise will probably be the end result, but the damage to reconversion and to labor-management relations might remain long after the U.A.W. and G.M. agree to agree.

The union cause was cleverly presented before the public by shrewd Walter Reuther, U.A.W. vice-president and head of the union's G.M. division. He put the company in the position of refusing to bargain collectively with the union. The union claims that the company can pay the requested 30 per cent wage increase without increased prices, and demands that the company open its books to prove or disprove the union's contention. The company claims that access to the books is a prerogative of management, that not even G.M. stockholders can see them.

Two days before the strike, 200 delegates of U.A.W. locals sent a 2,000-word restatement of the union's position to G.M. president Charles Wilson, asking the company to agree to arbitration of differences. The proposals were very interesting, though it is difficult to determine whether the union really was trying at the last minute to avoid a strike or whether they knew G.M. would turn them down cold, as it did. The union proposed that the contestants submit the dispute to a three-man arbitration board, comprised of one representative of management, one of labor, and a third, to be the chairman, selected by the other two members. The decision of the board was to be final and binding on both parties. Any wage increase ordered by the board was not to be used as a basis for a price increase by G.M. The board was to have full access to the books and records of both the union and the company, and "if the arithmetic contained in the books of the corporation, tested in public hearings, proves that it cannot pay an increase without price increases, we again state that we will accept less than 30 per cent."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In turning down the proposal, G.M. pointed out that it would have had to concede major issues to the union by agreeing that the arbitration board could have access to the company's books and that the pay increases agreed upon be retroactive to August 18. G.M. termed the proposal a suggestion, not to arbitrate, but to abdicate.

So the middle of December witnessed the world's strongest union, with a peak membership of 1,300,000, pitted against one of the world's strongest corporations. G.M. has announced that it will not discuss anything with the U.A.W. as long as the company books enter into the talks, and so Secretary Schwellenbach's efforts to bring the two parties together has been patently unsuccessful.

In spite of the strength of the union, G.M. seemed to have the staying power necessary to bring the workers to their knees. The entire U.A.W. has a strike fund of from $2,500,000 to $4,000,000, but the G.M. division has only $500,000. Reuther has told the striking employees that they will receive no strike benefits, but soup kitchens have been established to prevent actual hardship. If the individual savings of the men are not as great as has been anticipated, a hard winter for the workers seems inevitable.

In contrast, General Motors, a $1,100,000,000 corporation, is in a financially strong position. If the strike cuts heavily into profits, the corporation is entitled to rebates from the government on excess profits taxes paid during the war. Were G.M. to shut down for all of 1946, it could claim a maximum rebate of $160,000,000, which, with other income not affected by the strike, would still leave a profit of $30,000,000 without the sale of a single product.

As the strike has progressed, one major union miscalculation has appeared. The strategy of the U.A.W. was to pick on one manufacturer at a time and simultaneously to maintain peak production in his competitors' plants. It was hoped that the vigor of the competitive spirit would make the first victim give in when his rivals started to capture the huge consumer market. The flaw in the plan, however, is that General Motors, besides being a manufacturer of cars in its own right, also manufactures parts for other car makers, so when General Motors is shut down, other companies have to close.

A compromise on this issue was attempted when Charles Wilson suggested to the union that it re-open its parts and accessory division. Thomas, U.A.W. president, gladly accepted this proposal, but he reckoned without the local unions, who objected to opening any of the G.M. plants. Thomas hastily declared that he hadn't meant to dictate to any local unions, and that it was up to them individually whether or not they wished to open up the plants in question.

With the deadlock in the automobile negotiations and the demise of the ill-fated labor-management conference, legislation controlling labor unions is high on the congressional agenda for the year 1946.

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
PRODUCED BY UMI
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM FEATURES

Author of the stimulating article on the intellectual dilemma of our times, **Theodore M. Greene** has made important studies on the present educational system. Under his chairmanship, a committee of the American Council of Learned Societies published as its report the book, **Liberal Education Re-Examined.** Mr. Greene was also chairman of the Committee for Post-War Revision of the Curriculum of Amherst College. At present he is teaching at Stanford University on leave from his post as Professor of Philosophy at Princeton University. This article in FORUM is the first in a series on the overall subject, "The Rôle of Education in Our Society."

Before coming to Princeton, **Kingsley Davis** held positions at Smith College, Clark University and Pennsylvania State College. Recently he edited a volume of **The Annals** of the American Academy of Political and Social Science on "World Population in Transition" and is at present working on a book, **The Population in India.** The second part of his discussion on world population trends will appear in the February issue of FORUM.

What To Do With Germany is a problem which perplexes not only the statesmen in power, but also interested persons everywhere. The emphasis of one would-be solution has been on education. In this connection, FORUM has published two articles: "The Re-Education of Germany," by **Frederick H. Cramer,** in the October issue, and "Our Responsibility for German Universities," by **Sidney B. Fay,** in this issue. A political approach to German problems is taken by **Felix E. Hirsch,** of Bard College, also in this issue. Before leaving Germany, he was an editor on two leading liberal (of necessity, pre-Hitler) newspapers, **Acht-Uhr Abendblatt** and **Berliner Tageblatt.** Since then he has contributed frequently to American periodicals.

The author of the article on the silver bloc, **Nathan A. Baily,** is a price control editor of the Research Institute of America. Specializing in American economic history, Mr. Baily taught in the Department of Economics at City College of New York and acted as co-editor of **A Syllabus in Contemporary Economic Principles and Problems.** During the war he served as an education consultant for the Army specialized training program.

Financial editor and columnist of the **New York Post** and the only woman writing on finance for a major city newspaper, **Sylvia Porter** is known as "The Girl Wonder of Wall Street." In 1943 she received the National Headliners' Award for the "Best Financial and Business Reporting" of the year. This young woman, whose pet peeve is the Cartel system, has also written two books: **How to Make Money in Government Bonds** and **If War Comes to the American Home.**

How can real wages be increased? **Morley G. Dilke** says by lowering prices and **E. J. Lever** says by raising wages. After reading the FORUM, what do you think?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED